Capital Reporting Company Information Office Motion to Adopt Partial Settlement 05-05-2010

MAY 19 2010

1

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS Washington, D.C.

IN THE MATTER OF:

DIGITAL PERFORMANCE RIGHT in : Docket No. 2009-1 SOUND RECORDINGS and EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.

: CRB Webcasting III

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, May 5, 2010

The following pages constitute the Motion to Adopt Partial Settlement in the above-captioned matter at the Library of Congress, Madison Building, 101 Independence Avenue, Southeast, Washington, D.C., before Shari R. Broussard, RPR, CSR, of Capital Reporting Company, a Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia, beginning at approximately 9:30 a.m. when were present on behalf of the respective parties:

```
2
                    APPEARANCES
 1
 2
    Copyright Royalty Tribunal:
 3
          CHIEF JUDGE JAMES SLEDGE
          JUDGE WILLIAM ROBERTS
          JUDGE STANLEY C. WISNIEWSKI
          Library of Congress
 5
          Madison Building
          101 Independence Avenue, Southeast
 6
          Washington, D.C. 20540
 7
    On behalf of SoundExchange, Inc.:
 8
          MICHAEL B. DeSANCTIS, ESQUIRE
          GARRETT A. LEVIN, ESQUIRE
 9
          JARED O. FREEDMAN, ESQUIRE
          STEVEN R. ENGLUND, ESQUIRE
10
          Jenner & Block, L.L.P.
          1099 New York Avenue, Northwest
          Suite 900
11
          Washington, D.C. 20001
12
          (202) 649-6000
13
    On behalf of Live365, Inc.:
14
          DAVID D. OXENFORD, ESQUIRE
15
          Davis Wright Tremaine, L.L.P.
          1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest
16
          Suite 200
          Washington, D.C. 20006
17
          (202) 973-5256
18
   On behalf of Intercollegiate Broadcasting System:
19
          WILLIAM MALONE, ESQUIRE
          Miller & VanEaton, P.L.L.C.
          1120 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest
20
          Suite 1000
21
          Washington, D.C. 20036
          (202) 785-0600
22
```

```
3
 1
                    A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)
    On behalf of College Broadcasters, Inc.:
          MITCHELL I. STOLTZ, ESQUIRE
          CATHERINE GELLIS, ESQUIRE
          Constantine Cannon
          1301 K Street, Northwest
 5
          Washington, D.C. 20005
          (202) 204-4523
 6
    ALSO PRESENT:
 8
          Kyle Flynn
          Colin Rushing
 9
         Michael Huppe
          Suzanne Hand
10
          Joel Willer
          Wil Robedee
11
12
13
                       CONTENTS
   ARGUMENT
                                                    PAGE
15
     By Mr. Stoltz
                                               5, 64, 82
16
    By Mr. DeSanctis
                                                  22, 68
17
     By Mr. Malone
                                                  51, 80
18
19
    SOUNDEXCHANGE SETTLEMENT EXHIBIT: *
                                                     PAGE
20
   Number 1
                                                       27
21
                    (*Exhibit retained.)
22
```

		4
1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Our hearing today in	
3	the Webcasting III proceeding is to specifically	
4	address the motion to adopt the partial settlement	
5	made by SoundExchange and College Broadcasters, Inc.	
6	Mr. Stoltz, are you going to begin?	
7	MR. STOLTZ: Your Honor, we're prepared to	
8	introduce testimony in support of our motion for	
9	settlement.	
10	I'm wondering if we could get a	
11	clarification on the procedure for the hearing today	
12	regarding the order of presentation.	
13	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Yes. You're going	
14	first. What you feel you need to present may be	
15	nothing or it may be I think that's why you're the	
16	lawyer.	
17	MR. STOLTZ: Do Your Honors request	
18	testimony? We have a witness prepared to testify.	
19	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: We do not request	
20	testimony. We do not encourage anything. It would	
21	only be if you feel it necessary.	
22	MR. STOLTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.	

		5
1	Your Honors, we, again, renew our motion for	
2	the court to adopt the settlement between College	
3	Broadcasters, Inc., and SoundExchange, and we would	
4	like to reserve the right to rebut material introduced	
5	by any objections at the time	
6	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the motion?	
7	MR. STOLTZ: as well.	
8	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Let me ask a question	
9	that jumps up at me in the agreement that is proposed.	
10	In the beginning of your regulations you	
11	include an election process.	
12	MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor.	
13	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: How can there be an	
14	election process to regulations adopted by the judges?	
15	JUDGE ROBERTS: Mr. Stoltz, why don't you	
16	come up to the podium so the reporter can hear a	
17	little better.	
18	MR. STOLTZ: Absolutely.	
19	Your Honor, it was our understanding that a	
20	noncommercial educational webcaster would have the	
21	right to choose either the terms of the settlement	
22	that we have moved the Board to adopt or any other set	

		6
1	of rates and terms that might apply to them.	
2	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: I just don't understand	
3	how you could have regulations that are binding and	
4	have them permissive.	
5	Do you know of any set of regulations that	
6	allow a party to be bound by them or not, to elect to	
7	be bound by them?	
8	MR. STOLTZ: Well, my understanding in	
9	general is that settlements adopted through the	
10	Webcaster Settlement Act are voluntary on the part of	
11	copyright users users of the license.	
12	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: You misstated	
13	something. Settlements perhaps you didn't misstate	
14	something.	
15	Settlements entered under the Webcaster	
16	Settlement Act are not adopted. They're settled.	
17	MR. STOLTZ: That's correct.	
18	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: You are proposing	
19	something different. You are proposing adoption as	
20	regulations of a settlement that you have entered	
21	under the Webcaster Settlement Act.	
22	MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor, that's	

7

correct. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: So your statement is partially true, and I see no problem with a settlement reached under the Webcaster Settlement Act having an election process. The question is how can regulations that we adopt have an election process? How can 7 something be binding and be elective? 8 MR. STOLTZ: Again, my understanding of the agreement that College Broadcasters reached with 10 SoundExchange was that once chosen, then it's binding 11 on -- once elected by a webcaster, a noncommercial educational webcaster, the regulations would be 13 binding on both sides. 14 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: No, sir, not would be binding on both sides, would be binding on the world. 15 16 This agreement, if adopted, becomes law. 17 MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor. 18 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: How can law be elective? 19 20 MR. STOLTZ: I quess I don't see a contradiction of that, Your Honor. The options 21 available are essentially the -- would be -- should

8

this agreement be adopted as a regulation, the options available would be either this set of regs and terms 3 or any other set, again, in the regulations to which a particular webcaster applies, my understanding is it wouldn't be mutually exclusive because the definition of noncommercial educational webcaster is a subset of 7 the definition of noncommercial webcaster. 8 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Are you suggesting that if someone didn't opt into this, they would no longer be considered a noncommercial educational webcaster 10 11 but simply some other type of noncommercial webcaster? 12 MR. STOLTZ: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. 13 JUDGE ROBERTS: I have to say, Mr. Stoltz, that I share the confusion over this motion that the

- 16 If you reach this agreement under the
- 17 Webcaster Settlement Act and the Copyright Office
- 18 published it per the terms of the Webcaster Settlement
- 19 Act, what more do you need? Why do you need any
- 20 action from us? That's what's got me scratching my
- 21 head and I think everyone up here scratching their
- 22 heads.

15

other judges do.

9

MR. STOLTZ: I understand, Your Honor. 1 was our intent and, my understanding, also SoundExchange's intent that this set of rates and terms be available as precedent in future proceedings and it was for primarily that reason that we asked the Board to adopt this set of rates and terms as 7 regulations. 8 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: So you got Congress to say that it's not precedential and now you're acting here to make it precedential? 10 11 MR. STOLTZ: In this particular instance, 12 yes. 13 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: I'm sorry, Judge Roberts. 15 JUDGE ROBERTS: That's all right. 16 I'm looking at your proposed regulation and let's take Part 380, "Rates and terms for 17 noncommercial educational webcasters." It doesn't say 18 19 rates and terms for certain noncommercial educational webcasters or rates and terms for noneducational 21 webcasters affiliated with the college broadcasters. It says the entire category, "noncommercial

- 1 educational webcasters." But I hear you to say now
- 2 that if we were to adopt it, which you proposed, it
- 3 would only be certain noncommercial educational
- 4 webcasters and then presumably -- not presumably -- we
- 5 would have to set rates for all other noncommercial
- 6 educational webcasters however they are defined?
- 7 MR. STOLTZ: No, Your Honor, we do intend
- 8 these regulations be available to all noncommercial
- 9 educational webcasters as defined.
- 10 JUDGE ROBERTS: On an election basis you've
- 11 said.
- 12 MR. STOLTZ: On a default basis, Your Honor.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: On a default basis.
- So if a noncommercial educational webcaster
- 15 opted, according to what you've proposed, not to
- 16 follow those regulations -- again, we have issues
- 17 about how we can adopt regulations that are
- 18 elective -- but someone elects not to follow these,
- 19 what do they then follow? They just simply don't pay
- 20 SoundExchange?
- 21 MR. STOLTZ: No, Your Honor. My
- 22 understanding is they'd follow the -- either any of

- 1 the entered rates and terms under the Webcaster
- 2 Settlement Act that would apply to that entity or to
- 3 --
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Are there any others? I'm
- 5 not aware of any others other than the agreement that
- 6 you have for noncommercial educational broadcasters --
- 7 webcasters.
- 8 MR. STOLTZ: The NAB settlement, Your Honor.
- 9 JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. So you're saying that
- 10 you have a choice. If you are a noncommercial
- 11 educational webcaster, you can choose between either
- 12 what has been proposed through the NAB agreement or
- 13 this one?
- MR. STOLTZ: Some of them can, Your Honor,
- 15 yes.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Some of them can. Okay.
- 17 Does that mean all of them can or am I still
- 18 missing -- because there's still going to be people --
- 19 if we adopted the NAB agreement and your agreement,
- 20 are there still going to be noncommercial educational
- 21 webcasters that are not covered?
- MR. STOLTZ: No, Your Honor. It's my

- 1 understanding that any noncommercial educational
- 2 webcaster would be covered.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. Well, you guys did
- 4 not do a very good job in making this clear, that
- 5 between these two agreements all noncommercial
- 6 educational webcasters would be covered, that this
- 7 would apply to certain ones -- again, I don't see that
- 8 word or any subcategorization of that -- and that
- 9 certain others the terms of the NAB agreement could
- 10 apply. I just don't see that if we adopt these two as
- 11 is. And I agree with Judge Sledge that adopting a
- 12 regulation that is somehow elective and not specifying
- 13 what the alternative is would not be appropriate to
- 14 do.
- MR. STOLTZ: I understand, Your Honor. I
- 16 apologize for the confusion.
- 17 Again, it was -- it was our intent that this
- 18 be a default set of rates and terms for noncommercial
- 19 educational webcasters.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Stoltz, I don't
- 21 understand your use of the word "default."
- Default means that you don't take any action

- 1 and, therefore, you're covered.
- 2 That's not what your proposal suggests. You
- 3 have to take action to be covered by your proposed
- 4 settlement; isn't that correct? You have to elect in?
- 5 MR. STOLTZ: My understanding is that you do
- 6 not, Your Honor, have to elect in.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Isn't that what it says
- 8 in the regs here that you've submitted?
- 9 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: 380.1, Subsection B?
- 10 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: That's precisely the
- 11 point that Chief Judge Sledge started this discussion
- 12 out with.
- MR. STOLTZ: Your Honors, the proposal says,
- 14 "Noncommercial educational webcasters shall comply
- 15 with the requirements of Sections 112(b) and 114, the
- 16 rates and terms of this part," meaning the proposed
- 17 regulation, "however" -- that establishes the default.
- 18 It goes on to say, "However, if a noncommercial
- 19 educational webcaster is also eligible for any other
- 20 rates and terms, it may by written notice to the
- 21 collective elect to be subject to such other rates and
- 22 terms."

	14
JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: So you're suggesting it's	
an opt-out provision rather than an opt-in provision?	
MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor.	
JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: I also don't quite	
understand your reference to the NAB agreement.	
What provision in the NAB agreement covers	
noncommercial broadcasters?	
MR. STOLTZ: To be honest, I'm not sure,	
Your Honor.	
JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: It having been submitted	
as a settlement for commercial broadcasters, I wonder	
about that issue. Perhaps someone can clarify.	
JUDGE ROBERTS: Say, Mr. Stoltz, I'm looking	
at that agreement, at 380.2 of the NAB agreement, and	
I don't even see a definition of noncommercial	
broadcasters.	
MR. STOLTZ: My understanding is that a	
broadcaster operated by a nonprofit entity would not	
be precluded in some cases from using the NAB	
agreement.	
JUDGE ROBERTS: How would anyone know that?	
If I was a small, uninformed noncommercial	
	an opt-out provision rather than an opt-in provision? MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: I also don't quite understand your reference to the NAB agreement. What provision in the NAB agreement covers noncommercial broadcasters? MR. STOLTZ: To be honest, I'm not sure, Your Honor. JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: It having been submitted as a settlement for commercial broadcasters, I wonder about that issue. Perhaps someone can clarify. JUDGE ROBERTS: Say, Mr. Stoltz, I'm looking at that agreement, at 380.2 of the NAB agreement, and I don't even see a definition of noncommercial broadcasters. MR. STOLTZ: My understanding is that a broadcaster operated by a nonprofit entity would not be precluded in some cases from using the NAB agreement. JUDGE ROBERTS: How would anyone know that?

- 1 broadcaster that was webcasting and I look at this NAB
- 2 agreement here -- again, which is asked to be adopted
- 3 as our regulations -- I don't see anything even in the
- 4 definitional provision that refers to the
- 5 noncommercials. I would think that well, this doesn't
- 6 apply to me. But I hear you to say it might apply.
- 7 MR. STOLTZ: That was my understanding, Your
- 8 Honor.
- 9 JUDGE ROBERTS: Well, it may be your
- 10 understanding, but I wish you would point and explain
- 11 to us so that it would be our understanding because I
- 12 just don't see the language there.
- 13 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: So I think I understand
- 14 your answer to be that if we adopt this agreement,
- 15 then it would bind all noncommercial educational
- 16 webcasters unless they submit a notice prepared by
- 17 SoundExchange to SoundExchange that provides that they
- 18 are electing to be operating under another set of the
- 19 regulations for the statutory license, and I think
- 20 you're presuming that that notice would have a way to
- 21 identify which other provision of the regulations of
- 22 the statutory license they say will apply to them.

1 MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor. 2 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And if SoundExchange didn't agree with what they've said on the notice, 3 they would always have the option to consider that they are infringing and not operating under the terms 5 of the statutory license? 7 MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor, that's my understanding. 9 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And then the objection that's been raised by Intercollegiate Broadcaster 11 System you would answer that all they have to do is file the notice with SoundExchange, not be bound by this agreement, and they would be free to exercise the 13 14 statutory license assuming there is another set of 15 regulations under the license that apply to them? 16 MR. STOLTZ: To be honest, Your Honor, we never have been clear on precisely what the objection 17 18 of Intercollegiate Broadcasting System is. 19 The only notice of an objection that we've received were in the comments that IBS submitted on 21 April 22nd in response to the Federal Register 22 publication of April 1st. And my understanding of

- 1 those comments was that they objected to the entry of
- 2 the settlement as a regulation potentially earlier
- 3 than the conclusion of the Webcasting III proceeding,
- 4 and it's not clear to us what the -- what the import
- 5 of that objection is. And that's the only notice we
- 6 received of an objection.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Well, assuming that IBS
- 8 doesn't want to be bound or isn't interested in
- 9 electing the proposal that you have made, I still
- 10 didn't hear you answer Judge Sledge's question, which
- 11 is what's left for them then? What is their choice if
- 12 they choose not to opt in or opt out, whichever term
- 13 you wish to use, into the CBI agreement? What is
- 14 their choice then?
- MR. STOLTZ: Well, my understanding is
- 16 potentially none, Your Honor. It's depending on an
- 17 individual station's eligibility for the NAB agreement
- 18 or any other agreement that should be -- that may be
- 19 entered under the potential settlement agreement, but
- 20 --
- JUDGE ROBERTS: So in your view, then, IBS
- 22 is stuck with this? If we adopt this, this is the

- 1 only option that they're going to have because this is
- 2 the only terms and provisions that their stations are
- 3 going to be able to satisfy? I presume you're also
- 4 telling me that they're not going to meet the terms of
- 5 the NAB.
- 6 MR. STOLTZ: I don't -- I don't know that
- 7 for sure, Your Honor. I suspect it varies by station.
- 8 But, yes, in the absence of some other eligible set of
- 9 rates and terms, we are asking for these regulations
- 10 to be binding on all noncommercial educational
- 11 webcasters.
- 12 JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. You just spoke the
- 13 magic words there in the last sentence that I thought
- 14 when I read this initially that's what you were trying
- 15 to do and you indicated that no, that was not -- not
- 16 indicated -- said that's what you weren't trying to
- 17 do, that there was opt in/opt out if we jump over to
- 18 the NAB agreement, but with respect to noncommercial
- 19 educational broadcasters, for the most part they would
- 20 be bound, all of them would be bound by what you're
- 21 proposing here today?
- MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor.

19

1 JUDGE ROBERTS: All right. 2 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: What Judge Roberts just said, it sounds to me like you exactly contradicted 3 yourself. 5 If your goal is to bind all noncommercial educational webcasters, then why did you engage in 7 that long discussion about that this is a default and they have the ability to opt out simply by filing a notice with SoundExchange? 10 MR. STOLTZ: Well, forgive me if I spoke 11 imprecisely, Your Honor, but the -- what we're asking for, as Judge Wisniewski said, opt out, but that opt out is -- would be binding in the absence of any election of any other applicable settlement. 15 JUDGE ROBERTS: But there's nothing to opt out to unless you happen to be an educational 17 broadcaster that somehow could meet the terms of the NAB agreement, which presumably not very many would be 18 19 able to do. Then there's nothing to opt out to. 20 You're stuck with these rates here that CBI is 21 proposing. 22 MR. STOLTZ: In that case, yes, Your Honor.

- 1 Yes, such a webcaster would be stuck with these rates.
- 2 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: With this change of
- 3 direction, I'll ask you to answer again my first
- 4 question.
- Now that we can discount all the discussion
- 6 about opt out and default, how can we adopt
- 7 regulations that are binding on the world and be
- 8 elective?
- 9 MR. STOLTZ: Your Honor, they are elective
- 10 in the sense that any statutory license is elective.
- 11 Assuming that one is complying with a statutory
- 12 license for which one is eligible and has no other
- 13 statutory license available to them, then in that
- 14 sense they would be binding.
- 15 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Go ahead. You just
- 16 said there is no other statutory license available to
- 17 them.
- 18 MR. STOLTZ: I can't say that with complete
- 19 certainty, Your Honor, but my understanding is for
- 20 some there will not be.
- 21 JUDGE ROBERTS: I can. There is no other
- 22 statutory license for webcasting other than 114.

- 1 There can be private licenses or simply a webcaster
- 2 can choose not to pay anybody and be a copyright
- 3 infringer, but in terms of the statutory license this
- 4 is the only one.
- 5 MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor, but under 114
- 6 and under the Webcaster Settlement Act there are
- 7 different sets of rates and terms.
- 8 JUDGE ROBERTS: There are different sets of
- 9 rates and terms, yes, but applicable all to the same
- 10 license. That was the question. Is there -- and you
- 11 were saying well, there may be other statutory
- 12 licenses. There's only one statutory license.
- 13 I know some people like to refer to them as
- 14 multiple statutory licenses simply because they apply
- 15 to different categories of operators, but I think the
- 16 better point of view of that is that there is one
- 17 license in Section 114 under which a number of
- 18 different people operate. Just as with Section 111,
- 19 there's one license for cable operators, but a lot of
- 20 cable operators -- there's big ones, small ones, ones
- 21 that look different, wireless ones, wired ones, but
- 22 they all fit under the umbrella of the one license.

So there is no other statutory license. 1 it's this one and the regulations that we put forth or a private agreement or an agreement under the 3 Webcaster Settlement Act. Those are the only options. 5 Yes, that's correct, Your MR. STOLTZ: Honor, and I apologize if I spoke imprecisely before. 7 And given that definition and the text of our 8 proposal, we don't believe that it's elective. 9 JUDGE ROBERTS: Well, of course this is not 10 your agreement alone, so we'll hear what SoundExchange 11 at some point here has to say about it, but I think 12 you need to take a look at the language that you have proposed to us in light of today's discussion and 13 14 rethink your position. Maybe SoundExchange has 15 additional comments, I don't know. But I think I 16 understand now what you're saying. 17 MR. STOLTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Any other questions? 19 Thank you. 20 Mr. DeSanctis? 21 MR. DeSANCTIS: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 Your Honors, if I may start by addressing

- 1 some of the questions that you've raised this morning
- 2 on SoundExchange's motion for adoption of the
- 3 settlement.
- With respect to the CBI settlement -- I
- 5 apologize. It is the intent of the parties,
- 6 SoundExchange and both CBI, that the agreement, if
- 7 adopted as regulations, would apply to other
- 8 noncommercial educational webcasters that are members
- 9 of IBS.
- 10 Our reading of the statute is that once
- 11 parties have reached a settlement, that settlement can
- 12 be proposed almost as akin to a summary judgment
- 13 procedure. That settlement can be proposed early on
- 14 in the case, which is when SoundExchange did it, in
- 15 order to settle the case and avoid litigation. So if
- 16 it is adopted industry wide as regulations for
- 17 noncommercial educational webcasters, it would apply
- 18 to non-CBI members such as members of IBS.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Why didn't you say that in
- 20 your motion?
- 21 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: In the agreement.
- 22 JUDGE ROBERTS: In the motion or in the

- 1 agreement.
- 2 MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, we did say it
- 3 essentially in the agreement where noneducational --
- 4 I'm sorry -- noncommercial educational webcasters are
- 5 defined. It's not limited to CBI and its members.
- 6 It's --
- JUDGE ROBERTS: That's right.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Right, and that was very
- 9 intentional and that was not -- that was by design.
- 10 That wasn't something that we stumbled into or meant
- 11 to hide in any way.
- 12 JUDGE ROBERTS: Right, it was intended to
- 13 apply to noncommercial educational webcasters just as
- 14 you have titled your Exhibit A, Part 380, right?
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Yes, absolutely.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Then why is there language
- 17 in there about electing in or electing out?
- 18 MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, the electing in and
- 19 the electing out -- first let me let me say that the
- 20 NAB deal is not open to noncommercial webcasters.
- 21 That's actually in the NAB deal itself. That's at
- 22 380.11(4), defines a broadcaster as not a commercial

25 webcaster. 2 JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. 3 MR. DeSANCTIS: In turn, I think the opt-out provision in 380.2 was really meant to function much like --5 6 JUDGE ROBERTS: Would you say that section again, by the way, with respect to the NAB agreement? 8 MR. DeSANCTIS: Sure. I'm looking at the Federal Register version as published by the Copyright Office and I'm looking at Section 380.11 is the 1.1 definitions. 12 JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. 13 MR. DeSANCTIS: The second definition is 14 broadcaster and --15 JUDGE ROBERTS: So that's not part of what you have submitted here because what you've submitted for the joint motion to adopt partial settlement for 17 18 NAB only goes up to 380.8. 19 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: I thought I was addressing the NAB and not this. 20 21 MR. DeSANCTIS: Yes. 22 JUDGE ROBERTS: The NAB agreement only goes

26 up to 380.8 in what you've asked us to adopt. 2 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: No, this is the CBI agreement. 3 JUDGE ROBERTS: It is referring to the CBI 4 5 or NAB? 6 MR. DeSANCTIS: Your Honor, I think there might be a mix-up. You're looking at what we submitted --8 9 JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes. 10 MR. DeSANCTIS: -- and when it was published in the Federal Register, the provisions got 11 12 renumbered. 13 JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. MR. DeSANCTIS: Sorry if you and I weren't 14 15 on the same page. 16 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Oh. 17 MR. DeSANCTIS: I'm reading from the Federal Register publication, which I figured was sort of the 19 official version at this point. 20 JUDGE ROBERTS: Can you tell me then, since I don't have that in front of me, what section that would be of what you proposed? Is it the definitions

		27
1	part?	
2	MR. DeSANCTIS: It's in the definitions.	
3	JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay.	
4	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Are you going to give	
5	us the Federal Register first? Is that what you have?	
6	MR. DeSANCTIS: I do have the Federal	
7	Register version here.	
8	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Go ahead and	
9	MR. DeSANCTIS: Sure.	
10	We've marked this as SoundExchange	
11	Settlement Hearing Exhibit 1 so we can identify it.	
12	JUDGE ROBERTS: Thank you.	
13	(SoundExchange Exhibit Number 1 was	
14	marked for identification.)	
15	MR. DeSANCTIS: So where I was reading, just	
16	to go back to closing the loop on whether	
17	noncommercial educational webcasters, not the NAB	
18	deal, I think the answer there is no per what's been	
19	numbered in the Federal Register as 380.11(4).	
20	Broadcasters are defined, among other	
21	things, as not a noncommercial webcaster under the	
22	definition of 114(f).	

28 1 JUDGE ROBERTS: Fair enough. MR. DeSANCTIS: The parties certainly saw 2 the provision -- going back to 380.2 of subpart C in 3 the CBI deal, the opt-out provision that we've been 5 discussing. The parties certainly saw that as an analogy to the -- what we thought was the very 7 uncontroversial proposition that even when there are statutory rates parties can have their own private agreements. 10 JUDGE ROBERTS: That's always been the case 11 12 MR. DeSANCTIS: Which has always been the 1.3 case. 14 JUDGE ROBERTS: -- under any license. 15 MR. DeSANCTIS: That's right. So the intent of this provision was that the 16 deal -- the deal, if adopted as rates for the noncom 17 educational sector of the industry, would apply to everyone who meets the definition of noncom 19 educational webcaster, which is also included at 21 380.2(1), which is the definitions section for the NAB -- I'm sorry, the definitions section for the CBI

- 1 deal. In that section noncommercial educational
- 2 webcaster is defined.
- 3 So the thinking was anyone who met that
- 4 definition would be subject to these rates if adopted
- 5 as rates and terms for that sector of the industry.
- 6 What's been referred to today as an opt-out
- 7 provision would allow a webcaster to do is either to
- 8 have a private deal, or at the time that this was
- 9 submitted and still today we don't know, and we
- 10 certainly don't want to prejudge, whether the Web III
- 11 proceeding is going to include rates for noncommercial
- 12 webcasters. We have noncommercial educational
- 13 webcasters.
- In our proposal we have proposed to exclude
- 15 them from the Web III proceeding and they would be
- 16 governed here. But we don't know that that's going to
- 17 happen, and so the Web III proceeding might have some
- 18 rates or terms that are applicable by its terms to
- 19 potentially some noneducational -- noncommercial
- 20 educational webcasters.
- In addition, there are noncommercial deals
- 22 that have been published in the Federal Register that

- 1 various stations actually might be able to opt into if
- 2 they meet their terms. I'm thinking of religious
- 3 broadcasters and some others. So there you would have
- 4 a situation where a webcaster actually meets the
- 5 definitions of two regulatory regimes.
- Now I think we're in a situation where it's
- 7 not opt in and creating the sort of legal confusion in
- 8 that regard, but now you have a webcaster who either
- 9 has their own deal, which you want to encourage people
- 10 to do, or actually meets the definitions of two
- 11 regulatory regimes based on the sort of unique hybrid
- 12 nature of many college radio stations.
- 13 In that case what this offers is it offers
- 14 the station the option to essentially opt out of this
- 15 and opt into whichever one applies, which, of course,
- 16 would apply to them by its terms anyway. So it's
- 17 really not -- it's not really opt in or opt out. It's
- 18 allowing the webcaster to elect which scheme it's
- 19 going to be subject to if it happens to be subject to
- 20 two or more.
- 21 JUDGE ROBERTS: All the options that you
- 22 describe, with, of course, the exception of those with

- 1 respect to the Webcaster Settlement Act because we
- 2 haven't had that type of legislation regarding another
- 3 statutory license, but in terms of private agreements
- 4 and other arrangements, those are all possible and
- 5 occur under other statutory licenses. So you're
- 6 asking us to adopt regulations with this election
- 7 provision where no other statutory license and its
- 8 terms talks about electing in or electing out to some
- 9 other agreement that is not part of what is published
- 10 in the Code of Federal Regulations.
- 11 Why did you think that was a good thing to
- 12 do when no other set of regulations that we have
- 13 provides for that?
- 14 Certainly take, for instance, with 115 you
- 15 could have set the rate that songwriters were to
- 16 receive, but we could have put in unless, of course,
- 17 they have a private agreement with the record company,
- 18 and then that's the per play rate that they get or the
- 19 percentage or whatever they have. We didn't do that,
- 20 nobody asked us to do that, it's never been done that
- 21 way. Why is it necessary to do that now?
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Sure. I think -- a couple

- 1 of things. First of all, I think the standard that
- 2 we're looking at here being, given particularly that
- 3 no party or no nonparty objected to this provision, I
- 4 think what we're asking now is not whether it's a
- 5 reasonable basis for setting rates but whether it's
- 6 unlawful, which is, of course, where Your Honor
- 7 started this discussion with respect to this
- 8 provision. And though it may be true that this type
- 9 of provision -- first of all, I think this type of
- 10 provision does appear in the statute itself with
- 11 respect to private agreements. I think the statute
- 12 has always encouraged private agreements that would
- 13 actually trump regulatory provisions issued as part of
- 14 regulation. So I think there is precedent for it in
- 15 the private deal context.
- In the context where an entity may be
- 17 subject to two different regulatory schemes I don't
- 18 think the fact -- first of all, I don't know for sure,
- 19 but I trust, Your Honor, that that doesn't exist in
- 20 any other section. I can't imagine. I can't promise
- 21 I looked everywhere, but I trust Your Honor. And if
- 22 that's the case, then I think that doesn't make it

- 1 unlawful. It makes it unprecedented. But I don't
- 2 think there's anything in the statute or in the --
- 3 well, let's just say the statute -- that would
- 4 preclude it, and I think that's the standard that we
- 5 should be looking at; is there something in the
- 6 statute or obviously in the Constitution that
- 7 precludes it and renders something unlawful. And I
- 8 don't think that exists here.
- 9 This was a -- what the parties thought was,
- 10 you know, hopefully a practical solution to situations
- 11 that actually may cause greater confusion in the
- 12 future if you didn't have a provision like this, where
- 13 someone might be subject to two different deals.
- 14 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Mr. DeSanctis, you were
- 15 trying to give some example of that and, frankly, I
- 16 don't think you gave any example of that.
- 17 You talked about the religious broadcasters,
- 18 but you never took it to its conclusion to say what
- 19 regulatory scheme of noncommercial religious
- 20 broadcasters would be subject to that would be other
- 21 than this particular one.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, I think a non -- a

- noncommercial religious broadcaster would not necessarily be subject to this regime, which is defined --3 4 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Precisely. So can you 5 give us an example? You keep talking about the potential. 7 MR. DeSANCTIS: Yeah. 8 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: And I'd like an example, a real example of where some webcaster would be subject to two schemes. 11 MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, I think it's the other It's not whether other webcasters would way around. 13 be subject to the noncommercial educational structure that's being proposed today. It's whether 15 noneducational commercial webcasters that are subject 16 to the definition in 380.2(1) would be subject to some
 - JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: I understand that.
 - 19 That's precisely the question I'm asking you.
 - 20 MR. DeSANCTIS: I just wanted to make sure
 - 21 I --

17 other scheme.

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Give me an example of

- what other scheme they possibly could be subject to
 presently.

 MR. DeSANCTIS: I think -- okay. By
- 4 "presently" I'm presuming you're saying let's not
- 5 leave open what may or may not happen in the Web III
- 6 proceeding and I --
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Well, the only way this
- 8 seems to happen is if we adopt this settlement and we
- 9 adopt your proposal for noncommercial webcasters. So
- 10 other than your proposal, I don't see where there's a
- 11 basis for what you're saying.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, I think I know the
- 13 answer, but I don't want to misspeak. If I could just
- 14 confer with one of my colleagues for just a second.
- 15 (Brief pause.)
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Sorry. I appreciate the
- 17 indulgence.
- 18 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Sure.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: In the Federal Register,
- 20 Your Honor, Volume 74, Number 154, page 40624 dated
- 21 August 12, 2009, a WSA deal with noncommercial
- 22 religious broadcasters is published there.

1 The definition of who it applies to is 2 noncommercial webcasters generally, and it has a 3 definition that's there in the Federal Register. And I think it's not only possible but probable that many noncommercial educational webcasters would also meet 5 the definition of noncommercial webcasters for 7 purposes of that deal, which means that --8 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: That deal isn't under our 9 regulation, is it? 10 MR. DeSANCTIS: It's under the WSA. 11 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: So --12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Which is not the regulations. 13 14 JUDGE ROBERTS: Are you suggesting, 15 Mr. DeSanctis, because it got published in the Federal 16 Register, that makes it a regulation or makes it regulatory is the word you've been using? 17 18 MR. DeSANCTIS: No, of course it's not. 19 It's just agreed to by the parties. It's something 20 that additional parties can opt into, but it is not a 21 creature of a regulation, obviously which is only 22 something Your Honors can publish or adopt.

- 1 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: It's not binding on the
- 2 world? It's not law?
- 3 MR. DeSANCTIS: That's right. It's
- 4 available to be opted into. It's not binding on
- 5 anyone the way something would be if it were adopted
- 6 by this Court. And so -- but it is something that
- 7 parties can still opt into. And in terms of
- 8 regulation set by this Court, the answer there I think
- 9 would be the results of the Web III proceeding if
- 10 SoundExchange's proposal to carve out noncommercial
- 11 webcasters is not adopted.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Well, again, that's
- 13 prospective, as I've said.
- 14 I'm asking you for an example of when a
- 15 noncommercial webcaster was defined under the
- 16 regulations as having two different schemes available
- 17 to that noncommercial webcaster. As far as I know,
- 18 that's never occurred, has it?
- MR. DeSANCTIS: And I'm...
- 20 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Isn't the whole idea of
- 21 the statutory scheme to provide information to the
- 22 users so that they don't have any confusion such as

38 might arise from such a situation? 2 MR. DeSANCTIS: It is, and if I -- if I -- I don't even want to say if. I apparently did not answer your question and I'm sorry about that. I 5 think I was interpreting it a little bit more broadly than you had asked it. 7 There is the concern about Web III. are other sets of terms, maybe is a better phrase to use, that are available to webcasters from WSA deals that noncommercial educational webcasters would be 10 11 able to opt into whose terms they would meet and 12 satisfy. 13 But, no, in terms of an existing set of regulations that exist today, if this were adopted, I don't think there would be another set of regulatory terms unless it comes out in Web III. 17

- CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: So what I understand,
- then, is rather than an opt-in or opt-out or a
- default, the operation of 380.1(b), "Election," is 19
- simply a notice to SoundExchange that we are operating 20
- that -- we, webcaster, are operating under the 21
- statutory license, these are the regulations that we

- 1 believe we are operating under, and then if
- 2 SoundExchange believes that they are incorrect, then
- 3 their option would be to allege that they're an
- 4 infringer?
- 5 MR. DeSANCTIS: I think that's right. I
- 6 think that's right. It's not really opt in or opt
- 7 out. I think the way Your Honor put it is right.
- 8 These regulations are the regulations that would
- 9 apply. But any webcaster can put SoundExchange on
- 10 notice that they actually qualify for some other set
- 11 of terms that exist in the world and if SoundExchange
- 12 disagrees, then the entity would be an infringer.
- 13 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And all you're asking
- 14 from us in this proposed regulation is for authority
- 15 to require webcasters to give you such a notice?
- 16 MR. DeSANCTIS: I think that's right. So
- 17 that SoundExchange knows what's happening and why
- 18 they're getting the amounts of money they may be
- 19 getting or, you know, the reporting requirements they
- 20 may be getting, that's right. But I think it would
- 21 be -- even without this provision, I think small
- 22 webcasters could do that, right.

I think what this adds is the notice to 1 SoundExchange so that SoundExchange can know what's 2 going on and doesn't have to, you know, spend money 3 4 out of their, you know, enforcements or trying to 5 figure out what's going on. This just provides a very clear procedure from the outset. 7 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And if this agreement is adopted, then CBI would not continue in the Webcasting III proceeding, it would not be making any 10 proposed rates or terms in the Webcasting III 11 proceeding, and the only proposed rates and terms in Webcasting III would be submitted by IBS and 12 13 SoundExchange, and the regulations that are adopted in Webcasting III, then, would be the regulations that 14 15 apply to anyone who did not exercise the statutory 16 opportunity to elect into a WSA agreement? 17 MR. DeSANCTIS: I think that's right, Your 18 Honor, with the possible exception that I think if 19 this settlement were adopted by the Court, then IBS would not necessarily be putting on a case either. 20 21 In other words, this would act as an 22 industry-wide settlement for the noncommercial

41

educational webcasters the way I believe Section 801 is intended to operate. 3 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Doesn't that conflict with what you just told Judge Wisniewski, that you 5 expected the answer of an example that he asked you for situations when two regulations applied to one noncommercial educational webcasters, your answer was 7 any potential regulations that come out of Webcasting 8 9 III. 10 MR. DeSANCTIS: That's right, with respect to regulations from the Court, yes. And the reason we don't know whether that would happen is because we have proposed in our rate proposal to carve out educational noncommercial webcasters in the hope that 15 they would be subject to these regulations that are before the court today, but we just --17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Well, why can't you put those two together? 18 19 MR. DeSANCTIS: We just don't know. We just 20 don't know if that's going to happen. 21 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Help me understand how I can put those two statements, two positions

- 1 together.
- 2 If your example of when a notice may be
- 3 given under 380.1(b) is when two regulations apply to
- 4 one entity, one station, then they are giving notice
- 5 as to which regulation they seek to operate under, and
- 6 when asked when can that arise, the answer given was
- 7 if there are regulations that come out of Webcasting
- 8 III, then they would be regulations, and that if this
- 9 agreement is adopted, then those would be regulations
- 10 and the party might be subject to two different sets
- 11 of regulations.
- How does that fit with your statement that,
- 13 if this agreement is adopted, that it would be
- 14 industry wide and would apply to IBS members and
- 15 anyone else that operates as a noncommercial
- 16 educational webcaster?
- 17 MR. DeSANCTIS: Right. If our, and I do
- 18 want to answer your question precisely. If our -- if
- 19 the carve-out that SoundExchange is proposing in its
- 20 rate proposal is adopted by the Court, is accepted by
- 21 the Court, then the noncommercial educational
- 22 webcasters would be carved out of any regulations

- 1 coming out of the Web III proceeding. And if that's
- 2 the case, then we don't need this sentence. This
- 3 sentence can be excised if we're just looking at
- 4 statutory regulatory schemes, you know, issued by the
- 5 Court.
- 6 But if that carve-out of ours is not adopted
- 7 by the Court, and, of course, we don't know what the
- 8 Court will do, then any number of terms and
- 9 definitions might apply to noncommercial webcasters
- 10 and sweep in noncommercial educational webcasters.
- 11 And in that event what this sentence would do in
- 12 Section 380.2 is allow a noncommercial educational
- 13 webcaster who may meet both the definitions then
- 14 qualify under the definition of both statutory
- 15 structures to choose one or the other.
- 16 Certainly I hope that clarifies, but if I
- 17 was unsuccessful, please let me know.
- 18 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: It still sounds very
- 19 much to me like the first question that Judge Roberts
- 20 asked you, that why do you need this to be adopted,
- 21 and your answer is what you're trying to do is keep us
- 22 from adopting in Webcasting III any regulations other

44

than the ones you have proposed. 2 As you said, if we adopt the proposed regulations in Webcasting III, then this is 3 unnecessary because your proposal carves out noncommercial educational webcasters? 5 6 MR. DeSANCTIS: That's right. 7 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And if we adopt this agreement, then you say it will be binding industry wide and would prevent us from adopting any regulations in Webcasting III other than what you've 11 proposed? 12 MR. DeSANCTIS: I never agreed with the 13 proposition that you can adopt things other than what 14 we proposed, but I think you can adopt things other 15 than what we proposed even if this were adopted. 16 if this 380.2 were adopted or -- I'm sorry -- if the 17 whole CBI deal were adopted as regulations for that 18 limited sector of the industry, we certainly would be

advocating that it would make sense to, you know, very

webcasters out of the resulting Web III regulations,

but Your Honors presumably may not. And, you know, at

specifically carve noncommercial educational

- 1 the time that this was written I believe it was
- 2 unclear whether there would be noncommercial
- 3 webcasters litigating in the Web III case and there
- 4 was a lot of uncertainty as to where that might go.
- 5 As it turns out, obviously we only have Live
- 6 and noncommercial educational webcasters are
- 7 litigating in the case, which may make that carve-out
- 8 make more sense. But at the time this was written we
- 9 didn't know what noncommercial webcasters might be
- 10 participating in the case, so we didn't know where
- 11 that would go.
- If this is adopted, the CBI deal is adopted
- 13 as regulations, it would be our position that
- 14 certainly that would make the carve-out in our rate
- 15 proposal make a heck of a lot of sense, but, of
- 16 course, there may be countervailing interest and we
- 17 certainly don't want to prejudge what Your Honors may
- 18 do there.
- 19 JUDGE ROBERTS: Mr. DeSanctis, to cut to
- 20 your purpose here, if in Webcaster III we decide to
- 21 accept some form of the rates and terms proposed by
- 22 IBS for noncommercial educational broadcasters, then

-

- 1 you really need this language, don't you, because now
- 2 there would be potentially two regulatory schemes;
- 3 some that may want to have the IBS, whatever we set
- 4 for them, or set for the class based on the evidence
- 5 that they presented, and then you would have yours
- 6 that CBI had agreed to. So you would really need,
- 7 then, to have this and have language that talks about
- 8 election because it would be another set of
- 9 regulations, correct?
- 10 MR. DeSANCTIS: I don't think so. At least
- 11 that's not the way that -- I sort of envision it
- 12 rolling out maybe the other way around.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. That's fine.
- Now, if we don't accept IBS' proposal and we
- 15 adopt your proposal in your direct case, which is for
- 16 essentially this agreement, the carve-out for this,
- 17 then you don't need this language about elective in
- 18 the agreement because you got it, your agreement goes
- 19 into the Federal Register and it goes into the Code of
- 20 Federal Regulations, and that is now binding on all
- 21 noncommercial educational broadcasters.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Right.

47

1 JUDGE ROBERTS: So we don't need to talk about elections or anything like that at that point in 2 3 time, right? MR. DeSANCTIS: I believe that's right, and 4 5 that's probably articulated better than what I tried to answer Judge Sledge's question a moment ago. That if our rate proposal in Web III is adopted, this is 7 not necessary. The sentence at 380.2 that we've been discussing would not be necessary because noncommercial educational webcasters would be carved 11 out of those regulations and it's -- you know, looking at it that way, this really isn't necessary to this 12 deal at all. It's there to avoid confusion in the 13 event that there are overlapping statutory rate terms, 15 which at the time this was submitted we certainly thought there could be. 16 17 JUDGE ROBERTS: So adopting your proposal before we came out with Webcaster III would probably 18 just confuse things, wouldn't it? 19 20 MR. DeSANCTIS: No, I don't think it would. 21 JUDGE ROBERTS: Or potentially require an amendment once Webcaster III came out depending upon

- how we came out with it?
- 2 MR. DeSANCTIS: Depending upon what happens
- in Webcaster III. But I don't think it would be 3
- confusion until that time because this would be the
- 5 regulatory scheme applicable to noncommercial
- educational webcasters. There wouldn't be anything --
- of course this starts in 2011, so there's no current 7
- confusion, and I think the schedule for Web III is
- before that. So I don't think there should be any
- confusion in reality. 10
- 11 JUDGE ROBERTS: But there's nothing really
- to gain, is there, by rushing out to get this
- published, is it, and adopted?
- 14 MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, I think one thing it
- does and one thing that SoundExchange was intending,
- and I don't know if we've -- maybe we didn't make this
- 17 sufficiently clear in the motion. It's certainly been
- SoundExchange's position that settlements like this 18
- 19 that arise during the course of a proceeding before
- 20 this Court can be proposed as industry-wide
- 21 regulations to essentially settle -- they act as
- partial settlements of the Web III case and it

- 1 actually settles a sector -- settles the issues for a
- 2 sector of the webcasting industry, so -- which I think
- 3 is encouraged by Congress under the statute and it's
- 4 certainly, you know, welcomed to SoundExchange, who
- 5 litigates these cases all the time before Your Honors,
- 6 as you well know.
- 7 So if SoundExchange can make a settlement
- 8 that provides a reasonable basis for industry-wide
- 9 regulations, SoundExchange would certainly want to
- 10 have that adopted and, therefore, obviate the need to
- 11 continue to litigate those issues in this proceeding.
- 12 It actually acts as a settlement. And so if this were
- 13 adopted as the regulations, it would certainly be our
- 14 position that there's no need to continue litigating
- 15 with IBS over a noncommercial educational rate.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Let me follow-up. You said
- 17 something earlier about proposed settlements and I
- 18 want to be clear that I understand what your position
- 19 is.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Uh-huh.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: I believe I heard you say
- 22 earlier that if you propose a settlement, we publish

- 1 it in the Federal Register, it didn't get any comments
- 2 opposing the settlement, unless there is one or more
- 3 provisions in the settlement, we're bound to accept
- 4 it? Is that what you said or are now saying?
- 5 MR. DeSANCTIS: Yes, that would be my
- 6 position. And I think that's consistent both with the
- 7 statute and with the register decision from the
- 8 mechanicals case interpreting the relevant portion of
- 9 the statute.
- 10 JUDGE ROBERTS: Now let me ask you a
- 11 follow-up question to that.
- 12 If you propose a regulation that's got
- 13 confusing language in it, no one in the public
- 14 comments, it's not contrary to law but it's confusing
- 15 at best or perhaps just doesn't make a lot of sense,
- 16 are we still obligated to put it in the regulations?
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Your Honors, first of all,
- 18 SoundExchange -- we don't see this provision as being
- 19 critical to this deal and if Your Honors excised it, I
- 20 think the deal still stands on its own two feet as
- 21 industry-wide regulations without this provision, and
- 22 it would be similar to the way Your Honors excised

- 1 certain other provisions before it was even published.
- 2 There were a couple of provisions in each of the deals
- 3 that Your Honors deleted. And I think those kinds of
- 4 issues are within the Court's authority to -- the way
- 5 the Court phrased it was, and this is actually in the
- 6 Federal Register publication, was these are things
- 7 that are sort of not relevant to the statutory
- 8 license. And I think if something were unnecessary
- 9 and only caused confusion, which I'm not necessarily
- 10 saying this does, I think this provision served a
- 11 purpose, but I think that would be important.
- 12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Any other questions?
- JUDGE ROBERTS: No.
- 14 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Anything else? Are you
- 15 through?
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Yes, Your Honor.
- 17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right.
- 18 Mr. Malone?
- MR. MALONE: Thank you, Your Honor.
- If Your Honor please, the issue here I think
- 21 is more significant than merely that of confusion.
- I think Mr. DeSanctis' last remarks indicate

- 1 that this is an attempt to freeze IBS out of statutory
- 2 rights to a decision from the Board on the record.
- 3 My understanding is, from him, is that the
- 4 intent is to settle two of the parties on this issue
- 5 but not the third, who will be foreclosed, although
- 6 he's not a party to the agreement, he's not a party to
- 7 the motion and he's really got no redress as to
- 8 what -- his ability to show the Court on the record
- 9 why terms such as these are not fair and not in accord
- 10 with the statute.
- 11 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Well, let's be a little
- 12 bit more precise than that. Fairness is not an issue.
- 13 The only issue is whether we conclude that the
- 14 agreement provides a reasonable basis for statutory
- 15 rates and terms.
- 16 MR. MALONE: Well, I think if one looks at
- 17 the total statutory scheme here, one reaches a
- 18 somewhat different conclusion. The question I have
- 19 and I think --
- 20 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: The conclusion of what
- 21 I said or conclusion of what?
- MR. MALONE: Well, that there was not a

- 1 fairness issue here. We contend there's a very potent
- 2 fairness issue here.
- 3 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Well, I'm not going to
- 4 follow what you say. I'm going to follow what the
- 5 statute says.
- 6 MR. MALONE: I hope so, Your Honor.
- 7 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And the statute says
- 8 that it's adopted unless we conclude that the
- 9 agreement does not provide a reasonable basis for
- 10 setting rates and terms.
- 11 MR. MALONE: But I think, Your Honor, that
- 12 if -- again, the timing, the sequencing of this has a
- 13 lot to do with it. But if you terminate Web III as to
- 14 this issue, which is the, you know, the proper
- 15 decision on the record, then we've been frozen out of
- 16 an opportunity to object to such terms as these in the
- 17 evidentiary hearing.
- 18 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Malone, don't waste
- 19 your time or ours agreeing or disagreeing with the
- 20 statute. Spend your time arguing what your position
- 21 is under the statute. If you wish the statute had
- 22 said something else, then you're talking to the wrong

- 1 people.
- 2 MR. MALONE: Well, then I'm afraid I'm not
- 3 being understood, Your Honor. I take it that the
- 4 statute here is governing.
- Now, I think you're citing one particular
- 6 section of the statute which is invoked by a
- 7 settlement, but this is not a settlement in the sense
- 8 that we've agreed to anything. I mean you've got
- 9 three parties in the Web III proceeding on this issue.
- 10 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And the statute
- 11 provides for settlements to be reached by one or less
- 12 than all the parties. It doesn't require a settlement
- 13 to be reached by all the parties.
- MR. MALONE: All right. But I think it does
- 15 raise the threshold as to the level of examination
- 16 that the Court should give because you are cutting off
- 17 the hearing on the record.
- 18 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: As to whether it's
- 19 reasonable or not?
- MR. MALONE: Yes, that's right.
- 21 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Now you're fitting into
- 22 the statute.

55

1 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. MALONE: 2 And I come with a more fundamental question 3 I quess in the sense of whether this is necessary. you look where the parties were, you know, at the date 4 of the Federal Register -- publication by the register, the two parties between themselves had 7 everything to settle the issue between them, but what -- and, you know, it's put out there on public notice, it's sort of a most-favored nation provision or you might say it's a provision against 10 discrimination under Section 2(b) of the 11 12 Robinson-Pactman Act in the sense that this is 13 available to everybody who chooses to elect in by mere fact of publication under 114(f)(5). 15 Now, what they've done is they've tried to gild the lily here by coming in also with the same 16 agreement under 801(b)(7), and the question is what's 17 18 the motive here other than to freeze out IBS, which, 19 as you know, has chosen to take a different tack 20 toward the problem and presented a different case to the Board. And, you know, I don't see any advantage 21 at all to CBI by proceeding additionally against

- 1 801(b)(7). They've got the agreement if the members
- 2 agrees to it, but, you know, they don't need to ask
- 3 this Court under -- to proceed under 801(b)(7).
- 4 They've got it.
- Now, the one thing that -- and, you know, it
- 6 may not even be a settlement between two parties in
- 7 the sense that if -- we are hearing -- if CBI is
- 8 satisfied with this agreement, they have no standing
- 9 to ask for something more. And, you know, the effect
- 10 is to bind an unrelated third party to the agreement,
- 11 and I just --
- 12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And that's what the
- 13 statute says that it may do.
- 14 MR. MALONE: Well, I think it raises the
- 15 threshold as to, you know, whether it's reasonable or
- 16 not to proceed in this fashion.
- We also think, as to SoundExchange, they, of
- 18 course, would like to get out of this hearing on this
- 19 issue, but, in addition, it may have the effect of
- 20 bypassing the precedential ruling of the Court of
- 21 Appeals in Web II that, you know, there's got to be
- 22 some justification for imposing the \$500 minimum. And

- 1 it -- this is an interesting agreement because it has
- 2 an explicit nonprecedential -- precedential clause in
- 3 it. So that the -- and so this might look as though
- 4 it were a marketplace willing buyer/willing seller
- 5 rate \$500, and, again, I think that that's not where I
- 6 see the Court going.
- 7 The Court's precedent, as I understand it,
- 8 says there's got to be reasonableness in the -- there
- 9 must be record support, if you will, in any kind of
- 10 minimum rate.
- 11 This agreement also --
- 12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Malone, on that
- 13 last point, it appears to me that CBI is acting
- 14 opposite of what you said. You said that they're
- 15 seeking to have their agreement be nonprecedential.
- 16 MR. MALONE: I'm sorry, I was misunderstood.
- 17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: But they have, in fact,
- 18 asked that it be adopted as regulations, which means
- 19 that they're asking that it be precedent.
- MR. MALONE: Well, indeed, I think that it's
- 21 not CBI that is interested in that as much as
- 22 SoundExchange is, and I think the reason they may be

- interested in it, and this is speculation on my part, is that it gives them an actual agreement between a webcaster and SoundExchange as to, for instance, the \$500. And that, of course, then provides the basis or 5 might be argued to provide the basis for this Court to, when the Webcasting III rules, adopt \$500. 7 not justified by cost or some other reason. It merely is a benchmark, and --8 9 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Well, Mr. Malone, what does that have to do with submitting this agreement 11 for approval? 12 They could simply put the agreement into the record in Web III for that purpose without having it be approved. 14 15 MR. MALONE: Well, I agree, Your Honor, 16 except that the --
- 17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Which they've done.
- MR. MALONE: -- except that the 114(f)(7),
- 19 as I recollect, that it has a basis -- it has a caveat
- 20 in it that these agreements are not precedential. So
- 21 the agreement of the parties as to that issue does not
- 22 have the effect that the statute does.

		59
1	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: You've misstated the	
2	statute, Mr. Malone.	
3	MR. MALONE: All right. Sorry.	
4	JUDGE ROBERTS: I think we're getting a	
5	little confused on use of the word or the term	
6	"nonprecedential" because we've been talking about	
7	that in Webcaster III in the context of agreements	
8	reached under the Webcaster Settlement Act. And, as I	
9	recall, that when this CBI agreement was first offered	
10	to us there was a clause in it about how the terms of	
11	it would not be precedential in a future proceeding,	
12	and we took that provision out when we published it.	
13	So is that the provision that you're	
14	referring to, not the nonprecedential clause with	
15	respect to the Webcaster Settlement Act?	
16	MR. MALONE: Well, except for the fact that,	
17	Your Honor, it is still an agreement that was between	
18	these two parties, that was signed by them	
19	JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes.	
20	MR. MALONE: and so I think that the	
21	problem continues.	
22	JUDGE ROBERTS: I'm not sure what the	

- 1 problem is here.
- 2 MR. MALONE: The problem, Your Honor, as we
- 3 see it, is that by making this agreement -- by having
- 4 it published under the Webcaster Settlement Act, it
- 5 then -- and by making it public, not subject to
- 6 restrictions and quote-unquote settlement, they had
- 7 hoped to be able to cite this in the event the issue
- 8 remained in Webcasting III as a marketplace precedent,
- 9 which is, arguably, one basis on which this Court can
- 10 incorporate that into the Webcasting III order.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: So you're really using that
- 12 term in a third context? Of course they won't have
- 13 to -- if we adopted the agreement as they proposed it
- 14 and they now tell us that it would be binding on
- 15 everyone, we wouldn't have to be citing, or they
- 16 wouldn't have to be citing it as precedent. It would
- 17 already, by operation, be adopted, would it not?
- MR. MALONE: Absolutely, correct, Your
- 19 Honor.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. So we don't need to
- 21 worry about precedential.
- 22 Maybe in future proceedings it could be

- 1 cited as well \$500 is the lowest you can go, but
- 2 that's something for another day, yes?
- MR. MALONE: Well, I think the question is,
- 4 though, as to whether we're foreclosed by an agreement
- 5 between two of the three parties in the proceeding.
- 6 JUDGE ROBERTS: I understand your argument
- 7 on that.
- MR. MALONE: Thank you.
- 9 I think the other thing remaining, which is
- 10 not strictly germane to the question we've been
- 11 discussing, and that is that we see the agreement as a
- 12 concession by SoundExchange that the value of census
- 13 reporting as to stations such as this is a hundred
- 14 dollars because of the provision here which says you
- 15 can opt out of census reporting by paying over an
- 16 extra hundred dollars. And that certainly is relevant
- 17 to the census reporting rules that this Court has
- 18 under consideration in a collateral rule-making
- 19 proceeding and it also I think affects the balance in
- 20 Web III as to whether there should be census reporting
- 21 in the absence of a hundred dollar buyout.
- When you get to the instance of the

- 1 cost-benefit ratio, why, the cost is just, as the
- 2 testimony shows, the cost has been -- well, it's been
- 3 prohibitive in some cases, prohibitive over \$100
- 4 value, and we don't think that that is what Congress
- 5 had in mind in terms of rates set by this Court.
- I think that covers the points I wanted to
- 7 make.
- 8 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Actually can I follow-up
- 9 with you, Mr. Malone?
- 10 You mentioned two specific objections to
- 11 this agreement. When I say "specific," I mean in
- 12 terms of the actual terms, written terms of the
- 13 agreement. One being the \$500 minimum fee and the
- 14 other being the hundred dollars that you were just
- 15 talking about in lieu of census reporting.
- 16 Are there any other specific provisions of
- 17 this proposed settlement that you object to?
- 18 MR. MALONE: May I answer your question this
- 19 way, Your Honor: That the argument that IBS has been
- 20 putting forward is that for many of its smaller
- 21 stations, both high schools and colleges, the \$500 is
- 22 prohibitive, is a nonstarter with them, and, you know,

- 1 it basically cuts off their right to speak via the
- 2 Internet as part of their speeches and music lyrics
- 3 and something like that. And so there's I think that
- 4 problem that we see with this Court imposing in this
- 5 Web III or in the collateral rule-making proceeding,
- 6 which is -- there is still no final order, and I think
- 7 that the Board needs to look at that valuation that
- 8 SoundExchange has apparently agreed to, as to the
- 9 value of census reporting by stations of this class.
- 10 And I think that -- and there was also some testimony
- 11 by Ms. Kessler --
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Not to cut you off,
- 13 Mr. Malone --
- MR. MALONE: Yes, sir.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: -- but I understand that
- 16 that's one of the two objections that you have raised,
- 17 specific objections that you have raised to the
- 18 language of the proposed settlement.
- 19 Are there any other specific language
- 20 objections that you have to the proposed settlement?
- MR. MALONE: No. I think as long as it's
- 22 understood that our principal point here is that this

is trying to short circuit the opportunity to show to this Court that it does not take care of the whole class of noncommercial educational webcasters that it 4 purports to take care of because for some they're 5 simply foreclosed from going under those regulations because they couldn't possibly raise the money and --7 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, sir. 8 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Go ahead, Mr. Malone. 9 MR. MALONE: I think that concludes my remarks if the bench has no further questions. 11 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you, sir. 12 Mr. Oxenford, as a participant in this proceeding, anything to present on the motion to adopt 13 the settlement? 15 MR. OXENFORD: No, Your Honor, we didn't take any position on this motion. 16 17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right. We'll recess ten minutes. 18 19 (Brief recess.) 20 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. We'll come 21 to order. Mr. Stoltz, anything further?

MR. STOLTZ: Yes, Your Honor, we'd like the

- 1 opportunity to respond to several points that were
- 2 raised by Mr. Malone from IBS, and it's my
- 3 understanding SoundExchange also wishes to respond.
- 4 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right.
- 5 MR. STOLTZ: Your Honors, regarding the two
- 6 specific objections that Mr. Malone raised in this
- 7 hearing, CBI objects on the basis that we had no
- 8 notice of those specific objections until today.
- 9 The settlement was published in the Federal
- 10 Register on April 1st. Comments and objections were
- 11 due on April 22nd. IBS filed a statement on
- 12 April 22nd and that statement did not contain either
- 13 of these two objections that Mr. Malone raised today.
- 14 So as of this morning, we had no notice of them.
- We wanted to emphasize the point that should
- 16 the Board consider those two objections to specific
- 17 terms of CBI and SoundExchange's proposal, we want to
- 18 emphasize the point that the proposal was agreed on as
- 19 a whole rather than as a collection of individual
- 20 terms. So while a \$500 minimum standing in a vacuum
- 21 may, depending on the remainder of the set of terms,
- 22 may be reasonable or unreasonable, in this case both

- 1 College Broadcasters and SoundExchange believe and
- 2 mutually agreed and mutually move the Board to find
- 3 that those terms in toto are reasonable.
- 4 Also, I just had a clarification
- 5 regarding -- I think there may have been a confusion
- 6 between the CBI settlement and the NAB settlement.
- 7 The CBI settlement does not request that it
- 8 be nonprecedential. There's no reference to that in
- 9 the CBI settlement.
- 10 That's all I have. I'm happy to take
- 11 questions.
- 12 JUDGE ROBERTS: I have a question for you.
- 13 Is Mr. Malone right, that your agreement is looking to
- 14 freeze out IBS from Webcasting III?
- MR. STOLTZ: We're certainly not intending
- 16 to preclude IBS from -- I'm sorry, Your Honor, let me
- 17 restate that.
- The statute and, as we understand it, the
- 19 intent of Congress is to encourage settlement and
- 20 avoid the need for protracted litigation.
- It is CBI's and, we understand,
- 22 SoundExchange's intent to, having settled, avoid

67 litigation as to noncommercial educational webcasters. 1 2 JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes. MR. STOLTZ: That is our intent. 3 JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. But I haven't heard 5 you answer my question. 6 Why isn't Mr. Malone right that you're 7 freezing him out if this were to be adopted? MR. STOLTZ: Well, I wouldn't characterize 8 it in those terms, Your Honor, but the statute contemplates that less than all the parties can reach 10 11 a settlement and that the Court can adopt that 12 settlement as binding regulation. 13 JUDGE ROBERTS: Yeah. Is that reasonable? If you have three parties litigating in a proceeding 15 and parties A and B come to a settlement and submit it, the Board is supposed to accept it so that party C is left out; is that reasonable? 18 MR. STOLTZ: Yes, it is, Your Honor, with the additional condition that the Board decides that 19 the settlement reached is a reasonable one for all 20 those whom it affects, that is, noncommercial 21 22 educational webcasters.

		68
1	JUDGE ROBERTS: But is it reasonable to	
2	proceed in that fashion?	
3	MR. STOLTZ: I don't think that's a relevant	
4	question, Your Honor. The statute allows the Board to	
5	proceed in that fashion.	
6	JUDGE ROBERTS: It allows us to proceed in	
7	that fashion, but I'm asking you if that's reasonable.	
8	MR. STOLTZ: We believe it is.	
9	JUDGE ROBERTS: All right.	
10	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you.	
11	Mr. DeSanctis?	
12	MR. DeSANCTIS: Just a couple of very brief	
13	points if I may. Thank you. Thank you, Your Honors.	
14	And just very quickly, I'll try not to	
15	repeat what Mr. Stoltz said or belabor the points too	
16	long, but, number one, Mr. Malone claimed when he was	
17	standing here that his two objections are to the \$500	
18	minimum and to the hundred dollar fee for proxy	
19	reporting. Actually he submitted written comments on	
20	April 22nd per this Court's order. Even if those were	
21	literally construed as objections, neither of these	
22	are in there, so we think those objections are	

- 1 improper. They also just have absolutely no basis in
- 2 the record.
- 3 Mr. Malone's issue on the hundred dollar
- 4 point wasn't even really an objection to it. He was
- 5 just commenting on whether it indicates the value of
- 6 census reporting, and it certainly does not. It's
- 7 explained right in the provisions of the settlement
- 8 that that is to fund a proper proxy analysis that
- 9 would actually entitle SoundExchange to distribute
- 10 more money more accurately than the two-week sampling
- 11 that might otherwise apply.
- He objects now improperly to the \$500
- 13 minimum fee. There's no evidence in the record that
- 14 members of IBS can't afford \$500 and that it's
- 15 unreasonable. In fact, all the evidence in the record
- 16 suggests that, at least the members that he put on,
- 17 the witnesses that IBS put on, certainly can afford
- 18 that with profits in the tens of thousands of dollars.
- It is not a violation of free speech that
- 20 one has to pay to use copyrighted music regardless of
- 21 what Mr. Malone's clients may think to the contrary.
- 22 Over two dozen college radio stations submitted

- 1 comments to this court by April 22nd supporting the
- 2 deal. I think that speaks volumes for its
- 3 reasonableness.
- And, finally, to get to the point that Your
- 5 Honor was asking, Judge Roberts, and that Mr. Malone
- 6 started with, that he's somehow being frozen out of
- 7 this unfairly, I really want to address that because
- 8 it's extremely important to SoundExchange.
- 9 It is precisely what Section 801(b)(7)(a)
- 10 allows. Settlements that are reached by less than all
- 11 of the participants can be submitted to this Court for
- 12 adoption as industry-wide rates and terms unless
- 13 there's no reasonable basis for doing so or, another
- 14 way, if there is a reasonable basis -- if the
- 15 settlement provides a reasonable basis for adoption as
- 16 such. It's really important that that provision is in
- 17 there. And this case shows just how important it is.
- 18 It is designed in order to make these proceedings
- 19 efficient.
- 20 SoundExchange reached very reasonable
- 21 settlements with many, many parties, and they were
- 22 extremely proud of the settlements that they made in

- 1 this case, not just with noncommercial educational
- 2 webcasters but with broad sectors of the industry, as
- 3 Congress very much seemed to want, and that's good for
- 4 the entire industry.
- 5 It made reasonable settlements specifically
- 6 with College Broadcasters through CBI, and it's
- 7 precisely that point that, at least to us, what
- 8 801(b)(7)(a) is trying to prevent, is that a single
- 9 holdout who comes into Court with an unreasonable
- 10 theory and objecting to reasonable rates that everyone
- 11 else in their sector of the industry has agreed to can
- 12 put SoundExchange through an entire proceeding of this
- 13 Court and put Your Honors through an entire proceeding
- 14 of this Court when there is a very reasonable basis
- 15 already out there that can be adopted by this Court as
- 16 industry-wide regulations.
- 17 That efficiency is exactly what we think
- 18 Congress intended in Section 801(b)(7)(a), it's
- 19 exactly what SoundExchange was trying to accomplish
- 20 here, and is it reasonable, Judge Roberts, you kept
- 21 asking, absolutely. Not only is it reasonable, I
- 22 would posit that it is entirely unreasonable to let

- 1 one holdout who comes into Court with an entirely
- 2 unreasonable position waste Your Honors' resources,
- 3 which, of course, are federal resources of the
- 4 country, and to waste SoundExchange's time and
- 5 resources litigating issues against holdouts. I think
- 6 that's what the statute was intended for and that's
- 7 what SoundExchange is hoping to take advantage of
- 8 here.
- 9 JUDGE ROBERTS: Let's explore that a second,
- 10 Mr. DeSanctis.
- 11 Let us assume a webcasting proceeding to set
- 12 commercial rates. Ten commercial webcasters,
- 13 including SoundExchange, file direct cases. So
- 14 SoundExchange is one of the ten to litigate the
- 15 proceeding. SoundExchange finds one of the webcasters
- 16 negotiates a settlement, submits it to us. That
- 17 leaves eight webcasters that are not part of the
- 18 settlement.
- 19 Is it reasonable for us at that point in
- 20 time to terminate the proceeding and adopt the
- 21 settlement?
- MR. DeSANCTIS: In theory, yes. I think it

- 1 would depend on the record in the case.
- 2 If the settlements that was made didn't have
- 3 indicia of being a reasonable basis for the adoption
- 4 of industry-wide rates and terms, then no. And, of
- 5 course, those other participants, the eight or nine
- 6 other webcasters, have an opportunity to file
- 7 objections and to actually make a record as to what
- 8 about that settlement does not provide a reasonable
- 9 basis for industry-wide rates and terms. If --
- 10 JUDGE ROBERTS: Isn't that the point of the
- 11 proceeding though?
- 12 MR. DeSANCTIS: I think it's the point of
- 13 this proceeding. This hearing today actually is to
- 14 see whether there are credible objections that were
- 15 made timely with evidence that something about these
- 16 deals are unreasonable. Otherwise -- I think that's
- 17 exactly what Congress intended so that these --
- 18 Congress clearly favors settlements. And I think
- 19 it -- I think it is what Congress intended, that that
- 20 is exactly what happens if the record shows that the
- 21 settlement reached does provide a reasonable basis
- 22 and, of course, that's what Your Honors are to decide.

74

But if Your Honors decide that it does provide a reasonable basis for industry-wide rates and Your Honors are not swayed by any objections made by other 3 participants, then yes, I think that that would be 5 what --JUDGE ROBERTS: Isn't that inviting proceedings before the real proceeding? You said that the other, in my hypothetical question, that the other eight webcasters would have their opportunity to make objections to the settlement. Presumably one of those objections is 11 12 going to be you have to hear our evidence. 13 witnesses that are going to come in and testify and 14 show how the proposal is wholly unreasonable. 15 Where does that leave us at that point? 16 conduct a proceeding before the proceeding and say all 17 right, let's bring in these witnesses? 18 Isn't it more appropriate and more envisioned by the Congress that we have what Chapter 8 19 provides, and that is a proceeding to decide these 21 matters? MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, I don't think so. 22 The

- 1 only evidence we have of Congress' vision is the text
- 2 in the statute and the text of the statute in
- 801(b)(7)(a) clearly provides for industry-wide
- 4 adoption of these kinds of settlements in this
- 5 situation.
- I think Your Honors could have a, you know,
- 7 a hearing like you had today, which as far as I'm
- 8 aware hasn't been done before. I think that's
- 9 something that can be done any time such a settlement
- 10 is proposed.
- If, you know, if relevant witness testimony
- 12 wants to be provided, I suppose that could be. You
- 13 wouldn't need experts and everything else because the
- 14 point wouldn't be what is the right rate, the point
- 15 would be a settlement has been reached, there's no
- 16 evidence of it being a charade or illusory, this was
- 17 freely negotiated and, therefore, is there any reason
- 18 why it doesn't provide a rational basis.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Now, let's go further on
- 20 that though.
- If that's the proper procedure under the
- 22 statute, then the way I see this potentially working

- 1 out is SoundExchange reaches an agreement with one of
- 2 those nine webcasters, proposes it, the standard for
- 3 us to evaluate the proposal, which would be binding on
- 4 all the webcasters, all nine of the webcasters, would
- 5 be reasonableness. It would not be the willing buyer
- 6 and the willing seller. And is that what Congress
- 7 intended; that let's have this proceeding be about
- 8 reasonableness and willing buyer and willing seller?
- 9 We just don't ever get to that.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Again, all I have to go on
- 11 is the words of the statute in terms of what Congress
- 12 intended, but I think they did intend just that. And
- 13 one might ask what a wonderful world that might be if
- 14 we didn't have to have protracted willing buyer/
- 15 willing seller proceedings, you know, year after year.
- 16 It would actually be much more efficient.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: Well, I think what you're
- 18 saying is it's a wonderful world if you happen to be
- 19 the one that's proposing the settlement. If you're
- 20 the one that's not part of the settlement and you're
- 21 sitting there saying I have all my witnesses, my
- 22 testimony, I am willing to show what a willing buyer

77

- 1 and a willing seller would negotiate in the
- 2 marketplace, you would never get that opportunity to
- 3 do it.
- 4 MR. DeSANCTIS: Well, presumably whatever
- 5 webcasters settled wouldn't settle on unreasonable
- 6 terms.
- JUDGE ROBERTS: I don't know that. I
- 8 wouldn't know that.
- 9 MR. DeSANCTIS: Right, and that's why one
- 10 can have a hearing to say is there something about
- 11 this deal that makes us think that it would not
- 12 provide a reasonable basis. Is it, you know, one tiny
- 13 webcaster out of a hundred who are ready here to put
- 14 on evidence or is it actually half the market of the
- 15 industry sector that we're looking at? Is it, you
- 16 know -- I don't profess to be able to tell you what
- 17 those standards would be, but presumably there are any
- 18 number of ways that one could have a reasoned inquiry
- 19 into whether a particular settlement actually might
- 20 not provide a reasonable basis, and perhaps the
- 21 numbers that you just described might be a factor in
- 22 that determination.

		78
1	JUDGE ROBERTS: How can I know what is the	
2	reasonable basis if I don't hear the other side's	
3	proposals under the willing buyer and the willing	
4	seller stand?	
5	I'm hearing you to say that, in the	
6	hypothetical question I put to you, if SoundExchange	
7	negotiates with that webcaster and the webcaster comes	
8	forward to SoundExchange and says this is reasonable	
9	to me, we're willing to pay this and we're in this	
10	business and, therefore, you should adopt it because	
11	it's reasonable as far as we're concerned.	
12	MR. DeSANCTIS: Uh-huh.	
13	JUDGE ROBERTS: And I hear you to say yeah,	
14	then the Board should go ahead and adopt it.	
15	MR. DeSANCTIS: Yes.	
16	JUDGE ROBERTS: That's what you're saying?	
17	MR. DeSANCTIS: It is unless there's a	
18	reason why Your Honor thinks it's not reasonable. Of	
19	course, then it would be your job not to adopt it as	
20	industry-wide standards.	
21	I think what is equally unreasonable and	
22	inconsistent with 801(b)(7)(a) is that there can be	

- 1 very reasonable settlements reached with the entire
- 2 industry except two and then you have a proceeding
- 3 like this one. That's -- you know, I think the other
- 4 side of the coin is equally unreasonable and if
- 5 Congress hadn't addressed it, I'd be wasting my breath
- 6 up here trying to convince Your Honors that that's
- 7 what you should do. But Congress did address it, and
- 8 I think that shows that Congress did care and wanted
- 9 to foreclose those kinds of unreasonable proceedings.
- 10 You suggested a different extreme at the
- 11 other end of the spectrum, Judge Roberts.
- 12 JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: And where that line is, is
- 14 why you all are wearing the robes and I'm just making
- 15 arguments. And I think the hearing today is an effort
- 16 at ferreting out whether objections made are warranted
- 17 and whether settlements proposed are reasonable.
- 18 JUDGE ROBERTS: All right.
- MR. DeSANCTIS: Nothing further, Your
- 20 Honors.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Just before you go,
- 22 Mr. DeSanctis, I'm reminded that the settlements

		80
1	proposed the 112 rate.	
2	MR. DeSANCTIS: Yes, sir.	
3	JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: And I trust that you all	
4	are still on schedule to provide the brief that I	
5	asked for?	
6	MR. DeSANCTIS: Very much on schedule, Your	
7	Honor.	
8	JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.	
9	MR. STOLTZ: Your Honor, may I respond to	
10	the question just raised by Judge Roberts?	
11	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: No.	
12	Mr. Malone?	
13	MR. MALONE: Yes, Your Honor.	
14	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Anything further?	
15	MR. MALONE: Yes, Your Honor.	
16	In Mr. DeSanctis' last remarks about the	
17	holdout against all of the rest of the industry he	
18	posits the case where you all know about and that the	
19	proponents of the agreement represent the whole rest	
20	of the industry.	
21	We're prepared to show from the testimony of	
22	the witnesses that CBI is a minority player in the	
1		

- 1 market, as Mr. DeSanctis has characterized it, and
- 2 that, in fact, IBS represents a much larger number of
- 3 educational webcasters. And, you know, as Your Honor
- 4 is aware from our opening statement, if not otherwise,
- 5 our contention is how this agreement simply leaves us
- 6 nowhere to go, so I don't think that is reasonable.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Malone, can I ask
- 8 you, that being the case, why haven't we had any
- 9 comments from any of the individual webcasters that
- 10 are members of IBS who object to this?
- MR. MALONE: Well, Your Honor, our feeling
- 12 was that this -- since this was a proceeding on the
- 13 record, that we would have the problem of
- 14 authentication of that. We certainly were not willing
- 15 to attempt to bring in from all over the country a
- 16 wrath of small student stations strapped.
- Now, we did put on Mr. Murphy, the former
- 18 president of IBS, who testified to the interaction
- 19 that he had had over the years with the attendees at
- 20 the IBS conventions, and he did I think make a fairly
- 21 clear case for the proposition that most of these
- 22 stations, the smaller ones at least, had no financial

- 1 basis for paying the \$500. And --
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Perhaps I'm not being
- 3 clear in my question, but my question was why is it
- 4 that none of these stations submitted written comments
- 5 as IBS did on the 22nd?
- MR. MALONE: Well, if Your Honor please,
- 7 that does perhaps avoid the authentication issue, but
- 8 it also indicates that these stations were satisfied
- 9 with IBS' representation and, unlike CBI, we did not
- 10 solicit letters to the Board.
- JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.
- 12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right. Mr. Stoltz,
- 13 you said you had one more thing to say.
- 14 MR. STOLTZ: I did, Your Honor. On the
- 15 question that -- it was a very small point, Your
- 16 Honors, in further response to the question that Judge
- 17 Roberts asked Mr. DeSanctis.
- 18 The congressional record actually speaks
- 19 directly to the question of propriety of settlements
- 20 with less than all parties. This is the report from
- 21 the Committee of the Judiciary, the Copyright Royalty
- 22 and Distribution Act of 2003, page 24. Just very

briefly it says: "Clause 1 allows other participants in the relevant proceeding who would be bound by the proposed settlement to object to the CRJ's adoption of 3 the agreement. When an objection has been registered pursuant to Clause 1, Clause 2 gives the CRJ discretionary power to decline to adopt such agreement if they find based on the record before them that the 7 agreement is not likely to meet the relevant statutory standard. Because settlement agreements can be 10 offered at any time before final disposition of a 11 proceeding, the extent of the record before the CRJs 12 may vary widely depending on the timing of the 13 settlement agreement. Bearing in mind the objective 14 of encouraging settlement, the CRJs are to use their 15 best judgment as to whether the record before them 16 indicates that the proposed agreement is not likely to 17 meet the relevant statutory standard." 1.8 I'd just like to submit that for the record. 19 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you, Mr. Stoltz. 20 Anything else? 21 MR. MALONE: No, Your Honor. 22 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Well, that concludes

		84
1	the hearing and we'll review everything you've given	
2	us and make a decision as soon as we can.	
3	Thank you. We'll recess.	
4	(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at	
5	approximately 11:37 a.m.)	
6	* * * *	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

		85
1	CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC	
2	I, SHARI R. BROUSSARD, the officer before whom	
3	the foregoing hearing was taken, do hereby certify	
4	that the testimony appearing in the foregoing pages	
5	was taken by me in stenotypy and thereafter reduced to	
6	typewriting under my direction; that said	
7	transcription is a true record of the testimony given	
8	by said parties; that I am neither counsel for,	
9	related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the	
10	action in which this hearing was taken; and, further,	
11	that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or	
12	attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor	
13	financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of	
14	this action.	
15		
16		
17	Shori & Broussard	
18	SHARI R. BROUSSARD	
19	Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia	
20		
21	My commission expires:	
22	July 14, 2010	

Page 1

\$	200 2:16	40624 35:20	above-captioned
\$100 62:3	20001 2:11		1:12
\$500 56:22 57:5	20005 3:5	5	absence 18:8
58:4,6 61:1 62:13,21 65:20	20006 2:16	5 1:8 3:15	19:13 61:21
68:17 69:12,14	2003 82:22	51 3:17	absolutely 5:18 24:15 60:18 69:1
82:1	20036 2:21	6	71:21
	2009 35:21	64 3:15	accept 45:21 46:14
$\frac{1}{13:2027:11,13}$	2009-1 1:5	649-6000 2:12	50:3 67:16
83:1,5	2010 1:8 85:21	68 3:16	accepted 42:20
1000 2:20	2011 48:7		accomplish 71:19
101 1:13 2:5	202 2:12,17,21 3:5	7	accord 52:9
1099 2:10	204-4523 3:5	74 35:20	according 10:15
11:37 84:5	20540 2:6	785-0600 2:21	accurately 69:10
111 21:18	22 3:16	8	act 6:10,16,21 7:4
112 80:1	22nd 16:21	8 74:19	8:17,19 11:2 21:6 22:4 31:1
112(b 13:15	65:11,12 68:20	80 3:17	40:21 48:21
1120 2:20	70:1 82:5	801 41:1	55:12 59:8,15
114 13:15 20:22	24 82:22	801(b)(7 55:17	60:4 82:22
21:5,17	27 3:20	56:1,3	acting 9:9 57:13
114(f 27:22	3	801(b)(7)(a 70:9	action 8:20 12:22
114(f)(5 55:14	380 9:17 24:14	71:8,18 75:3 78:22	13:3 85:10,14
114(f)(7 58:18	380.1 13:9	82 3:15	acts 49:12 actual 58:2 62:12
115 31:14	380.1(b 38:19 42:3	02 3.13	
12 35:21	380.11 25:10	9	actually 24:21 30:1,4,10 32:13
1301 3:4	380.11(4 24:22	9:30 1:17	33:11 39:10
14 85:21	27:19	900 2:11	49:1,12 51:5
154 35:20	380.2 14:14 25:4	973-5256 2:17	62:8 68:19 69:9 73:7,13 76:16
1919 2:15	28:3 43:12 44:16		77:14,19 82:18
1st 16:22 65:10	47:8	A a.m 1:17 84:5	addition 29:21
	380.2(1 28:21 34:16	ability 19:8 52:8	56:19
2	380.8 25:18 26:1	able 18:3 19:19	additional 22:15
2 83:5	500.0 25.10 20.1	30:1 38:11 60:7	36:20 67:19
2(b 55:11	4	77:16	additionally 55:22

Page	2
------	---

address 4:4 70:7	afford 69:14,17	43:12	appearing 85:4
79:7	•		~~ ~
	afraid 54:2	allowing 30:18	appears 57:13
addressed 79:5	against 55:10,22	allows 68:4,6	applicable 19:14
addressing 22:22	72:5 80:17	70:10 83:1	21:9 29:18 48:5
25:20	ago 47:6	alone 22:10	applied 41:6
adds 40:1	agreed 36:19	already 60:17	applies 8:4 30:15
adopt 1:11 4:4	44:12 46:6 54:8	71:15	36:1
5:2,22 7:6 9:6	63:8 65:18 66:2	alternative 12:13	apply 6:1 11:2
10:2,17 12:10	71:11		12:7,10 15:6,22
15:14 17:22 20:6	agreeing 53:19	am 11:17 76:22	16:15 21:14
25:17 26:1 31:6	agreement 5:9	85:8,11	23:7,17 24:13
35:8,9 36:22	7:9,16 8:1,16	amendment 47:22	28:18 30:16 39:9
44:2,7,13,14	11:5,12,19 12:9	among 27:20	40:15 42:3,14
46:15 58:6 64:13 67:11 72:20	14:5,6,14,20	amounts 39:18	43:9 69:11
78:10,14,19 83:6	15:2,14 16:13	analogy 28:6	appreciate 35:16
	17:13,17,18,19		appropriate 12:13
adopted 5:14	18:18 19:18	analysis 69:8	74:18
6:9,16 7:16 8:1 11:19 15:2	22:3,10 23:6,21	answer 15:14	, ,,,,,
23:7,16 28:17	24:1,3 25:7,22	16:11 17:10 20:3	approval 58:11
29:4 37:5,11	26:3 31:9,17	27:18 35:13 37:8	approved 58:14
38:14 40:8,13,19	40:7,16 42:9,13	38:4 41:5,7	approximately
42:9,13,20	44:8 46:16,18 52:6,14 53:9	42:6,18 43:21	1:17 84:5
43:6,20	55:17 56:1,8,10	47:6 62:18 67:5	April 16:21,22
44:15,16,17	57:1,11,15	anybody 21:2	65:10,11,12
45:12 47:7 48:13	58:2,10,12,21	anyone 14:21 29:3	68:20 70:1
49:10,13 53:8	59:9,17 60:3,13	37:5 40:15 42:15	arguably 60:9
57:18 60:13,17	61:4,11 62:11,13	anything 4:20 15:3	.
67:7 71:15	66:13 76:1 80:19	33:2 47:2 48:6	argued 58:5
adopting 12:11	81:5	51:14 54:8	arguing 53:20
43:22 44:9 47:17	83:4,6,8,13,16	64:13,21 80:14	argument 3:14
adoption 6:19 23:2	agreements 12:5	83:20	61:6 62:19
70:12,15 73:3	28:9 31:3	anyway 30:16	arguments 79:15
75:4 83:3	32:11,12 58:20	apologize 12:16	arise 38:1 42:6
advantage 55:21	59:7 83:9	22:6 23:5	48:19
72:7	ahead 20:15 27:8		
advocating 44:19	64:8 78:14	apparently 38:3 63:8	arrangements 31:4
affects 61:19 67:21	akin 23:12		
	allege 39:3	Appeals 56:21	articulated 47:5
affiliated 9:21	o .	appear 32:10	assume 72:11
	allow 6:6 29:7		

	ı ag	,00	
assuming 16:14 17:7 20:11	becomes 7:16 begin 4:6	briefly 83:1 bring 74:17 81:15	43:6 45:7,14 46:16
attempt 52:1 81:15	beginning 1:16	broad 71:2	carves 44:4
attendees 81:19 attorney 85:12	5:10 behalf 1:17 2:7,13,18 3:2	broadcaster 14:18 15:1 16:10 19:17 24:22 25:14 34:1	case 19:22 23:14,15 28:10,13 30:13
August 35:21	belabor 68:15	broadcasters 3:2 4:5 5:3 7:9 9:21	32:22 40:20 43:2 45:3,7,10 46:15
authentication 81:14 82:7 authority 39:14	believe 22:8 39:1 41:1 45:1 47:4 49:21 66:1 68:8	11:6 14:7,11,16 18:19 27:20 30:3	48:22 50:8 55:20 65:22 70:17 71:1 73:1 80:18
51:4 available 7:22 8:2	believes 39:2 bench 64:10	33:17,20 35:22 45:22 46:21 66:1 71:6	81:8,21 cases 14:19 49:5 62:3 72:13
9:4 10:8 20:13,16 37:4,16 38:9 55:13	benchmark 58:8 best 50:15 83:15	Broadcasting 2:18 16:18	categories 21:15
Avenue 1:13 2:5,10,15,20	better 5:17 21:16 38:8 47:5	broadly 38:5 Broussard 1:14	category 9:22 CATHERINE 3:3
avoid 23:15 47:13 66:20,22 82:7	bind 15:15 19:5 56:10	85:2,18 Building 1:13 2:5	cause 33:11 caused 51:9
aware 11:5 75:8 81:4	binding 6:3 7:7,10,13,15 18:10 19:13	business 78:10 buyer 76:5,8,14,22 78:3	caveat 58:19 CBI 17:13 19:20 23:4,6 24:5
B balance 61:19	20:7,14 37:1,4 44:8 46:20 60:14 67:12 76:3	buyer/willing 57:4 buyout 61:21	26:2,4 28:4,22 40:8 44:17 45:12 46:6 55:22 56:7
based 30:11 46:4 83:7	bit 38:5 52:12 Block 2:10	bypassing 56:20	57:13,21 59:9 65:7,17 66:6,7,9
basically 63:1 basis 10:10,12,13	Board 5:22 9:6 52:2 55:21 63:7	C cable 21:19,20	71:6 80:22 82:9 CBI's 66:21
32:5 35:11 49:8 52:14 53:9 58:4,5,19 60:9 65:7 69:1	65:16 66:2 67:16,19 68:4 78:14 82:10	Cannon 3:4 Capital 1:15	census 61:12,15,17,20 62:15 63:9 69:6
70:13,14,15 71:14 73:3,9,21	bound 6:6,7 16:12 17:8 18:20 50:3 83:2	care 64:2,4 79:8 carve 37:10 41:13 44:20	certain 9:19 10:3 12:7,9 51:1
74:2 75:18 77:12,20 78:2 82:1	breath 79:5 brief 35:15 64:19	carved 42:22 47:10	certainly 28:2,5 29:10 31:14 43:16 44:18
Bearing 83:13	68:12 80:4	carve-out 42:19	45:14,17 47:15 48:17 49:4,9,13

Page	4
------	---

61:16 66:15 69:6,17 81:14 certainty 20:19 CERTIFICATE 85:1 certify 85:3 change 20:2 Chapter 74:19 characterize 67:8 characterized 81:1 charade 75:16 Chief 2:3 4:2,13,19 5:6,8,13 6:2,12,18 7:2,14,18 9:8,13 13:9,11 15:13 16:2,9 19:2 20:2,15 22:18 23:21 25:19 26:2,16 27:4,8 35:18 36:12 37:1 38:17 39:13 40:7 41:3,17,21 43:18 44:7 51:12,14,17 52:11,20 53:3,7,18 54:10,18,21 56:12 57:12,17 58:17 59:1 64:8,11,17,20 65:4 68:10 80:11,14 82:12 83:19,22 choice 11:10 17:11,14	chosen 7:10 55:19 circuit 64:1 cite 60:7 cited 61:1 citing 54:5 60:15,16 claimed 68:16 clarification 4:11 66:4 clarifies 43:16 clarify 14:12 class 46:4 63:9 64:3 clause 57:2 59:10,14 83:1,5 clear 12:4 16:17 17:4 40:6 48:17 49:18 81:21 82:3 clearly 73:18 75:3 clients 69:21 closing 27:16 Code 31:10 46:19 coin 79:4 Colin 3:8 collateral 61:18 63:5 colleagues 35:14 collection 65:19 collective 13:21 college 3:2 4:5 5:2 7:9 9:21 30:12 66:1 69:22 71:6	comes 38:16 71:9 72:1 78:7 coming 43:1 55:16 commenting 69:5 comments 16:20 17:1 22:15 50:1,14 65:10 68:19 70:1 81:9 82:4 commercial 14:11 24:22 34:15 72:12 commission 85:21 Committee 82:21 company 1:15 31:17 complete 20:18 comply 13:14 complying 20:11 concern 38:7 concerned 78:11 concern 38:7 concerned 78:11 concession 61:12 conclude 52:13 53:8 concluded 84:4 concludes 64:9 83:22 conclusion 17:3 33:18 52:18,20,21 condition 67:19 conduct 74:16 confer 35:14	confused 59:5 confusing 50:13,14 confusion 8:14 12:16 30:7 33:11 37:22 47:13 48:4,8,10 51:9,21 66:5 Congress 1:1,12 2:4 9:8 49:3 62:4 66:19 71:3,18 73:17,18,19 74:19 75:1 76:6,11 79:5,7,8 congressional 82:18 Connecticut 2:20 consider 16:4 65:16 consideration 61:18 considered 8:10 considered 8:10 consistent 50:6 Constantine 3:4 constitute 1:10 Constitution 33:6 construed 68:21 contemplates 67:10 contend 53:1 contention 81:5 context 32:15,16 59:7 60:12
choice 11:10	7:9 9:21 30:12	conduct 74:16	context 32:15,16

Page	5
------	---

continues 59:21	67:11 70:1,11	45:12 47:13	26:6,10,14,17
contradicted 19:3	71:9,13,14,15	50:19,20 70:2	27:2,6,9,15
contradiction 7:21	72:1	77:11	28:2,12,15 31:22 33:22 34:7,11,20
contrary 50:14 69:21	Court's 51:4 57:7 68:20	deals 29:21 33:13 38:9 51:2 73:16	35:3,12,16,19 36:10,18 37:3,19
conventions 81:20	covered 11:21 12:2,6 13:1,3	decide 45:20 73:22 74:1,20	38:2 39:5,16 40:17 41:10,19
convince 79:6	covers 14:6 62:6	decides 67:19	42:17 44:6,12
copyright 1:1 2:2 6:11 8:17 21:2 25:9 82:21	CRB 1:5 creating 30:7	decision 50:7 52:2 53:15 84:2	46:10,22 47:4,20 48:2,14 49:20 50:5,17 51:16
copyrighted 69:20	creature 36:21	decline 83:6	68:12 72:22
correct 6:17 7:1	credible 73:14	default 10:12,13	73:12 74:22 76:10 77:4,9
13:4 22:5 46:9	critical 50:19	12:18,21,22 13:17 19:7 20:6	78:12,15,17
60:18	CRJ 83:5	38:19	79:13,19 80:2,6
cost 58:7 62:1,2 cost-benefit 62:1	CRJs 83:11,14 CRJ's 83:3	defined 10:6,9 24:5 27:20 29:2	DeSanctis 3:16 22:20 33:14
counsel 85:8,11	CSR 1:14	34:3 37:15	36:15 45:19
countervailing		defines 24:22	51:22 68:11 72:10 79:22
45:16	current 48:7	definition 8:5,7	80:16 81:1 82:17
country 72:4	cut 45:19 63:12 cuts 63:1	14:15 22:7 25:13 27:22 28:19 29:4	describe 30:22
81:15		34:16 36:1,3,6	described 77:21
couple 31:22 51:2 68:12	cutting 54:16	43:14	design 24:9
course 22:9		definitional 15:4	designed 70:18
30:15,22 31:16 32:6 36:18 43:7	D.C 1:2,7,14 2:6,11,16,21 3:5	definitions 25:11 26:22 27:2	determination 77:22
45:16 48:7,19	date 55:4	28:21,22 30:5,10 43:9,13	different 6:19
56:18 58:4 60:12	dated 35:20	deleted 51:3	21:7,8,15,18,21
72:3 73:5,22 78:19	DAVID 2:14		32:17 33:13 37:16 42:10
court 5:2 37:6,8	Davis 2:15	depend 73:1	52:18 55:19,20
40:19 41:11,16	day 61:2	depending 17:16 47:22 48:2 65:21	79:10
42:20,21	deal 24:20,21	83:12	DIGITAL 1:5
43:5,7,8 48:20 51:5 52:8 54:16	27:18 28:4,17	desanctis 2:8	direct 46:15 72:13
56:3,20 57:6	29:1,8 30:9	22:21	direction 20:3
58:5 60:9 61:17 62:5 63:4 64:2	32:15 35:21 36:7,8 44:17	24:2,8,15,18 25:3,8,13,21	85:6

Page 6

			
directly 82:19	12:1,6,19	46:17	2:8,9,14,19 3:3
disagreeing 53:19	13:14,19 15:15	elects 10:18	essentially 7:22
disagrees 39:12	18:10,19 19:6,16 23:8,17 24:4,13	eligibility 17:17	24:3 30:14 46:16
discount 20:5	27:17 28:18,20	eligible 13:19 18:8	48:21
discretionary 83:6	29:1,12,20 34:13	20:12	establishes 13:17
discrimination	36:5 38:10	else 42:15 51:14	evaluate 76:3
55:11	41:1,7,14 42:16,21	53:22 71:11	event 43:11 47:14
discussing 28:5	43:10,12 44:5,20	75:13 83:20	60:7
47:9 61:11	45:6,22 46:21	emphasize	everybody 55:13
discussion 13:11	47:10 48:6 49:15	65:15,18	everyone 8:21
19:7 20:5 22:13	64:3 67:1,22	employed 85:9,12	28:19 60:15
32:7	71:1 81:3	employee 85:11	71:10
disposition 83:10	effect 56:9,19 58:22	encourage 4:20	everything 55:7
distribute 69:9		30:9 66:19	75:13 84:1
Distribution 82:22	efficiency 71:17	encouraged 32:12	everywhere 32:21
District 1:16 85:19	efficient 70:19 76:16	49:3	evidence 46:4
Docket 1:5		encouraging 83:14	69:13,15 73:15 74:12 75:1,16
	effort 79:15	enforcements 40:4	77:14
dollar 61:21 68:18 69:3	eight 72:17 73:5 74:9	engage 19:6	evidentiary 53:17
dollars 61:14,16		ENGLUND 2:9	exactly 19:3
62:14 69:18	either 5:21 8:2 10:22 11:11 29:7	entered 6:15,20	71:17,19
done 31:20 55:15	30:8 40:20 65:12	11:1 17:19	73:17,20
58:17 75:8,9	elect 6:6 13:4,6,21	entire 9:22	examination 54:15
dozen 69:22	30:18 40:16	71:4,12,13 79:1	example 33:15,16
due 65:11	55:13	entirely 71:22 72:1	34:5,8,9,22
	elected 7:11	entitle 69:9	37:14 41:5 42:2
during 48:19	electing 15:18 17:9	entity 11:2 14:18	except 58:16,18
	24:17,18,19 31:8	32:16 39:12 42:4	59:16 79:2
earlier 17:2	election 5:11,14	entry 17:1	exception 30:22
49:17,22	7:5,6 10:10	envision 46:11	40:18
early 23:13	19:14 31:6 38:19 46:8	envisioned 74:19	excised 43:3
educational 5:20		EPHEMERAL	50:19,22
7:12 8:6,10	elections 47:2	1:6	exclude 29:14
9:18,19	elective 7:7,19	equally 78:21 79:4	exclusive 8:5
10:1,3,6,9,14	10:18 12:12 20:8,9,10 22:8	1	exercise 16:13
11:6,11,20	20.0,7,10 22.0	ESQUIRE	

Page	7
------	---

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
40:15	36:3,15 46:19,20	forgive 19:10	giving 42:4
Exhibit 3:19,21	50:1 51:6 55:5	form 45:21	goal 19:5
24:14 27:11,13	65:9 72:3	former 81:17	governed 29:16
exist 32:19 38:14	fee 62:13 68:18 69:13	forth 22:2	governing 54:4
39:11	feel 4:14,21	forward 62:20	greater 33:11
existing 38:13	feeling 81:11	78:8	guess 7:20 55:3
exists 33:8	feet 50:20	frankly 33:15	guys 12:3
expected 41:5		free 16:13 69:19	gJ
experts 75:13	ferreting 79:16	FREEDMAN 2:9	<u> </u>
expires 85:21	figure 40:5	freely 75:17	half 77:14
explain 15:10	figured 26:18	freeze 52:1 55:18	Hand 3:9
explained 69:7	file 16:12 72:13 73:6	66:14	happen 19:16
explicit 57:2	filed 65:11	freezing 67:7	29:17 35:5,8
explore 72:9		front 26:21	41:12,20 76:18
extent 83:11	filing 19:8	frozen 53:15 70:6	happens 30:19 48:2 73:20
extra 61:16	final 63:6 83:10	function 25:4	happy 66:10
extreme 79:10	finally 70:4	fund 69:8	hayen't 31:2 67:4
extremely 70:8,22	financial 81:22	fundamental 55:2	81:8
	financially 85:13	future 9:4 33:12	having 7:4 14:10
F	finds 72:15	59:11 60:22	37:16 58:13 60:3
fact 32:18 55:14	fine 46:13	No.	66:22
57:17 59:16 69:15 81:2	first 4:14 20:3	<u>G</u>	head 8:21
factor 77:21	24:19 27:5 32:1,9,18 43:19	gain 48:12	heads 8:22
fair 28:1 52:9	50:17 59:9	GARRETT 2:8	hear 5:16 10:1
fairly 81:20	fit 21:22 42:12	GELLIS 3:3	15:6 17:10 22:10 74:12 78:2,13
	fitting 54:21	general 6:9	•
fairness 52:12 53:1,2	Flynn 3:8	generally 36:2	heard 49:21 67:4
fashion 56:16	follow-up 49:16	germane 61:10	hearing 4:2,11 27:11 53:17
68:2,5,7	50:11 62:8	getting	54:17 56:7,18
favors 73:18	foreclose 79:9	39:18,19,20 59:4	65:7 73:13 75:7
federal 16:21 25:9	foreclosed 52:5	gild 55:16	77:10 78:5 79:15 84:1,4 85:3,10
26:11,17	61:4 64:5	given 22:7 32:2	heck 45:15
27:5,6,19 29:22	foregoing 85:3,4	42:3,6 84:1 85:7	
31:10 35:19		gives 58:2 83:5	Help 41:21

Page 8

	1 42	, 	
hereby 85:3	hope 41:14 43:16	47:7,18,22	incorrect 39:2
hereto 85:12	53:6	48:3,8,22 53:13	indeed 57:20
he's 52:6,7 70:6	hoped 60:7	54:9 58:6,13 59:7 60:8,10	Independence
hide 24:11	hopefully 33:10	61:20 63:5 66:14	1:13 2:5
high 62:21	hoping 72:7	I'll 20:3 68:14	indicate 51:22
holdout 71:9 72:1	hundred	illusory 75:16	indicated 18:15,16
80:17	61:13,16,21	I'm 4:10 9:13,16	indicates 69:5 82:8
holdouts 72:5	62:14 68:18 69:3 77:13	11:4 14:8,13	83:16
honest 14:8 16:16		24:4 25:8,10	indicia 73:3
Honor 4:7,22	Huppe 3:9	26:17 28:22 30:2	individual 17:17
5:12,19 6:22	hybrid 30:11	34:19 35:4 37:14,19 38:4	65:19 81:9
7:17,21 8:12 9:1	hypothetical 74:8	44:16 51:9	indulgence 35:17
10:7,12,21	78:6	53:3,4 54:2	industry 23:16
11:8,14,22 12:15	T	57:16 59:22	28:18 29:5 42:14
13:6 14:3,9 15:8	I IDS 16 20 17 7 21	66:10,16 68:7	44:8,18 49:2
16:1,7,16 17:16	IBS 16:20 17:7,21	75:7 78:5	71:2,4,11 77:15
18:7,22 19:11,22	23:9,18 40:12,19 42:14 45:22	79:14,22 82:2	79:2 80:17,20
20:9,19 21:5 22:6,17,21 26:6	46:3,14 49:15	imagine 32:20	industry-wide
32:6,19,21 35:20	52:1 55:18 62:19	import 17:4	40:22 48:20 49:8
39:7 40:18	65:2,11 66:14,16	_	50:21 70:12
51:16,19,20	69:14,17	important 51:11 70:8,16,17	71:16 73:4,9
53:6,11 54:3	81:2,10,18,20	· · ·	74:2 75:3 78:20
55:1 58:15 59:17	82:5,9	imposing 56:22	information 37:21
60:2,19 62:19	I'd 34:8 79:5 83:18	63:4	infringer 21:3
64:15,22 66:16	idea 37:20	imprecisely 19:11	39:4,12
67:9,18 68:4 70:5 78:18	identification	22:6	infringing 16:5
80:7,9,13,15	27:14	improper 69:1	initially 18:14
81:3,11 82:6,14	identify 15:21	improperly 69:12	•
83:21	27:11	in/opt 18:17	inquiry 77:18
Honors 4:17 5:1	II 56:21	Inc 2:7,13 3:2 4:5	instance 9:11
13:13 22:22		5:3	31:14 58:3 61:22
36:22 44:22	III 1:5 4:3 17:3	include 5:11 29:11	intend 10:7 76:12
45:17 49:5	29:10,15,17 35:5		intended 24:12
50:17,19,22 51:3	37:9 38:7,16	included 28:20	41:2 71:18 72:6
65:5 68:13 71:13	40:9,10,12,14 41:9 42:8	including 72:13	73:17,19 76:7,12
72:2 73:22	43:1,22	inconsistent 78:22	intending 48:15
74:1,3 75:6	44:3,10,21	incorporate 60:10	66:15
79:6,20 82:16	45:3,20	medi poi ate 00.10	
L	10.0,20		

F			
intent 9:2,3 12:17	36:4,10,18,19	28:1,10,14 30:21	jumps 5:9
23:5 28:16 52:4	37:1,2,3,4 39:6	33:14	justification 56:22
66:19,22 67:3	47:11,13 48:17	34:4,8,18,22	· ·
intentional 24:9	49:3 50:14 53:8	35:7,18	justified 58:7
	54:18 55:8,9,10	36:8,11,12,14	
interaction 81:18	56:15 57:20 58:6	37:1,12,20 38:17	K
Intercollegiate	62:2 63:21 65:2	39:13 40:7	Kessler 63:11
2:18 16:10,18	69:6,14 70:8,16	41:3,4,17,21	kinds 51:3 75:4
interest 45:16	71:6,18 73:12	43:18,19 44:7	79:9
1	76:18 78:11,18	45:19 46:13	
interested 17:8	I've 37:13	47:1,6,17,21	Kyle 3:8
57:21 58:1 85:13		48:11 49:16,21	
interesting 57:1	J	50:10	L
Internet 63:2	JAMES 2:3	51:12,13,14,17	L.L.P 2:10,15
		52:11,20	language 15:12
interpreting 38:5 50:8	JARED 2:9	53:3,7,18	22:12 24:16
	Jenner 2:10	54:10,18,21	46:1,7,17 50:13
introduce 4:8	job 12:4 78:19	56:12 57:12,17	63:18,19
introduced 5:4		58:9,17	larger 81:2
inviting 74:6	Joel 3:10	59:1,4,19,22	<u> </u>
	joint 25:17	60:11,20 61:6	last 18:13 51:22
invoked 54:6	Judge 2:3,4	62:8 63:12,15	57:13 80:16
isn't 13:4,7 17:8	4:2,13,19	64:7,8,11,17,20 65:4 66:12	law 7:16,18 37:2
36:8 37:20 47:12	5:6,8,13,15	67:2,4,13	50:14
67:6 73:10	6:2,12,18	68:1,6,9,10 70:5	lawyer 4:16
74:6,18	7:2,14,18 8:8,13	71:20 72:9 73:10	
issue 14:12 51:20	9:8,13,15	74:6 75:19 76:17	least 46:10 69:16 71:7 81:22
52:4,12,13	10:10,13	77:7 78:1,13,16	
53:1,2,14 54:9	11:4,9,16	79:11,12,18,21	leave 35:5 74:15
55:7 56:19 58:21	12:3,11,20	80:3,8,10,11,14	leaves 72:17 81:5
60:7 69:3 82:7	13:7,9,10,11	81:7	legal 30:7
issued 32:13 43:4	14:1,4,10,13,21	82:2,11,12,16	_
	15:9,13 16:2,9	83:19,22	legislation 31:2
issues 10:16	17:7,10,21 18:12	judges 1:1 5:14	less 54:11 67:10
49:1,11 51:4	19:1,2,12,15	8:15	70:10 82:20
72:5	20:2,15,21 21:8		let's 9:17 33:3 35:4
it's 7:10 9:9 11:22	22:9,18	judgment 23:12	52:11 72:9 74:17
14:1 17:4,16	23:19,21,22	83:15	75:19 76:7
22:2,8 24:5,6	24:7,12,16	Judiciary 82:21	
27:2	25:2,6,12,15,19,	July 85:21	letters 82:10
30:6,16,17,18	22		level 54:15
31:20 32:4,5	26:2,4,9,13,16,2	jump 18:17	LEVIN 2:8
34:11,12,14	0 27:3,4,8,12		

			
Library 1:1,12 2:4	lowest 61:1	62:18 65:21,22	misstate 6:13
license 6:11	lyrics 63:2	66:5 68:13 69:21	misstated 6:12
15:19,22	•	80:9 83:12	59:1
16:6,14,15	M	maybe 22:14 38:8	misunderstood
20:10,12,13,16,2	Madison 1:13 2:5	46:12 48:16	57:16
2	magic 18:13	60:22	MITCHELL 3:3
21:3,10,12,17,19 ,22 22:1 28:14	Malone 2:19 3:17	mean 11:17 54:8	
31:3,7 38:22	51:18,19	62:11	mix-up 26:7
51:8	52:16,22	meaning 13:16	moment 47:6
licenses 21:1,12,14	53:6,11,18	means 12:22 36:7	money 39:18 40:3
31:5	54:2,14,20 55:1	57:18	64:6 69:10
lieu 62:15	56:14	meant 24:10 25:4	morning 23:1
1	57:12,16,20	mechanicals 50:8	65:14
light 22:13	58:9,15,18 50:2 3 16 20		most-favored 55:9
likely 83:8,16	59:2,3,16,20 60:2,18 61:3,8	meet 18:4 19:17 30:2 36:5 38:11	motion 1:11 4:4,8
lily 55:16	62:9,18	43:13 83:8,17	5:1,6 8:14
limited 24:5 44:18	63:13,14,21	meets 28:19	23:2,20,22 25:17
line 79:13	64:8,9 65:2,6,13	30:4,10	48:17 52:7
1	66:13 67:6 68:16		64:13,16
literally 68:21	70:5 80:12,13,15	members 23:8,18 24:5 42:14 56:1	motive 55:18
litigate 49:11	81:7,11 82:6 83:21	69:14,16 81:10	move 66:2
72:14		mentioned 62:10	moved 5:22
litigates 49:5	Malone's 69:3,21	mere 55:13	multiple 21:14
litigating 45:3,7	marked 27:10,14		Murphy 81:17
49:14 67:14 72:5	market 77:14 81:1	merely 51:21 58:7	music 63:2 69:20
litigation 23:15	marketplace 57:4	met 29:3	
66:20 67:1	60:8 77:2	Michael 2:8 3:9	mutually 8:5 66:2
little 5:17 38:5 52:11 59:5	material 5:4	Miller 2:19	N
1	matter 1:4,12	mind 62:5 83:13	NAB 11:8,12,19
Live 45:5	matters 74:21	minimum 56:22	12:9
Live365 2:13	may 1:8 4:14,15	57:10 62:13	14:5,6,14,19
long 19:7 63:21	13:20 15:9 17:18	65:20 68:18	15:1 17:17
68:16	21:11 22:22	69:13	18:5,18 19:18
longer 8:9	32:8,16 33:11	minority 80:22	24:20,21
loop 27:16	35:5 39:18,20	minutes 64:18	25:7,18,20,22 26:5 27:17 28:21
lot 21:19 45:4,15	42:2 43:13 44:22 45:7,16,17 46:3	missing 11:18	66:6
50:15 53:13	56:6,13,19 57:22	misspeak 35:13	nation 55:9
		misspeak JJ.1J	**************************************

nature 30:12	49:15 64:3	17:5,6 69:4 83:4	39:1
necessarily 34:2	67:1,21 71:1	objections 5:5	operation 38:19
40:20 51:9	noncommercials	62:10	60:17
necessary 4:21	15:5	63:16,17,20	operators
31:21 47:8,9,12	none 17:16 82:4	65:6,8,10,13,16	21:15,19,20
55:3		68:17,21,22	
	noneducational	73:7,14	opportunity 40:16
negotiate 77:1	9:20 24:3 29:19	74:3,10,11 79:16	53:16 64:1 65:1
negotiated 75:17	34:15	objective 83:13	73:6 74:10 77:2
negotiates 72:16	nonparty 32:3	ů l	opposing 50:2
78:7	nonprecedential	objects 65:7 69:12	opposite 57:14
	57:2,15 59:6,14	obligated 50:16	
neither 68:21 85:8	66:8	obviate 49:10	opt 8:9 17:12
nine 73:5 76:2,4			18:17
nobody 31:20	nonprofit 14:18	obviously 33:6	19:8,12,15,19
,	nonstarter 62:22	36:21 45:5	20:6
non 33:22	nor 85:9,12	occur 31:5	30:1,7,14,15,17
non-CBI 23:18	· ·	occurred 37:18	36:20 37:7 38:11
noncom 28:17,19	Northwest		39:6 61:15
	2:10,15,20 3:4	offered 59:9 83:10	opted 10:15 37:4
noncommercial	Notary 1:15	offers 30:13	opt-in 14:2 38:18
5:20 7:11	85:1,18	Office 8:17 25:10	
8:6,7,10,11	nothing 4:15		option 16:4 18:1
9:18,19,22	19:15,19 48:11	officer 85:2	30:14 39:3
10:3,5,8,14	79:19	official 26:19	options 7:21 8:1
11:6,10,20		Oh 26:16	22:4 30:21
12:1,5,18	notice 13:20		opt-out 14:2 25:3
13:14,18	15:16,20	okay 11:9,16 12:3	28:4 29:6 38:18
14:7,15,22 15:15	16:3,12,19 17:5	18:12 25:2,12	
18:10,18 19:5	19:9 38:20	26:13 27:3 35:3	order 4:12 23:15
23:8,17	39:10,15 40:1	46:13 60:20 67:4	60:10 63:6 64:21
24:4,13,20	42:2,4 55:9	ones 12:7 21:20,21	68:20 70:18
27:17,21	65:8,14	44:1 81:22	others 11:4,5 12:9
29:1,11,12,19,21	nowhere 81:6	open 24:20 35:5	30:3
33:19 34:1,13		·	otherwise 69:11
35:9,21 36:2,5,6	<u> </u>	opening 81:4	73:16 81:4 85:13
37:10,15,17 38:10 40:22	object 53:16 62:17	operate 21:18 41:2	
	81:10 83:3	42:5	ours 43:6 53:19
41:7,14 42:15,21		operated 14:18	outcome 85:13
43:9,10,12 44:5,20	objected 17:1 32:3	·	outset 40:6
44:3,20	objecting 71:10	operates 42:15	
46:21 47:10 48:5	objection	operating 15:18	overlapping 47:14
70.21 77.10 70.3	16:9,17,19	16:5 38:20,21	Oxenford 2:14

(866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com © 2010

1	1 48		
64:12,15	21:13,18 30:9	40:18	presumably 10:4
	54:1	possibly 35:1 64:6	19:18 44:22
P	per 8:18 27:18	potent 53:1	74:11 77:4,17
P.L.L.C 2:19	31:18 68:20	potential 17:19	presume 18:3
page 3:14,19 26:15	percentage 31:19	34:6 41:8	presuming 15:20
35:20 82:22	PERFORMANCE		35:4
pages 1:10 85:4	1:5	potentially 17:2,16 29:19 46:2 47:21	prevent 44:9 71:8
partial 1:11 4:4	perhaps 6:13	75:22	primarily 9:5
25:17 48:22	14:12 50:15	power 83:6	principal 63:22
partially 7:3	77:20 82:2,7	practical 33:10	private 21:1 22:3
participant 64:12	permissive 6:4	precedent 9:4	28:8 29:8
participants 70:11	phrase 38:8	32:14 57:7,19	31:3,17
73:5 74:4 83:1	phrased 51:5	60:8,16	32:11,12,15
participating	play 31:18	precedential	probable 36:4
45:10	player 80:22	9:9,10 56:20	probably 47:5,18
particular 8:4	^ •	57:2 58:20 59:11	problem 7:3 55:20
9:11 33:21 54:5	please 43:17 51:20 82:6	60:21	59:21 60:1,2
77:19		precise 52:12	63:4 81:13
particularly 32:2	podium 5:16	precisely 13:10	procedure 4:11
parties 1:18	point 13:11 15:10	16:17 34:4,19	23:13 40:6 75:21
23:5,11 28:2,5,8	21:16 22:11	42:18 70:9 71:7	proceed 56:3,16
33:9 36:19,20	26:19 47:2 57:13	preclude 33:4	68:2,5,6
37:7 52:4	63:22 65:15,18 69:4 70:4 71:7	66:16	, ,
54:9,12,13	72:19 73:10,12	precluded 14:19	proceeding 4:3 17:3 29:11,15,17
55:4,6 56:6	74:15 75:10,12	•	35:6 37:9
58:21 59:18 61:5	82:15	precludes 33:7	40:9,11 43:1
67:10,14,15	points 62:6 65:1	prejudge 29:10	48:19 49:11 54:9
70:21 82:20	68:13,15	45:17	55:22 59:11
85:8,9,12		prepared 4:7,18	61:5,19 63:5
party 6:6 32:3	portion 50:8	15:16 80:21	64:13 67:14
42:10 52:6 56:10	posit 71:22	present 1:17 3:7	71:12,13
67:16	position 22:14	4:14 64:13	72:11,15,20
pause 35:15	45:13 48:18	presentation 4:12	73:11,13
pay 10:19 21:2	49:14,18 50:6	^	74:7,16,20 76:7 79:2 81:12
69:20 78:9	53:20 64:16 72:2	presented 46:5 55:20	83:2,11
paying 61:15 82:1	positions 41:22	presently 35:2,4	proceedings 9:4
Pennsylvania 2:15	posits 80:18	president 81:18	60:22 70:18 74:7
people 11:18	possible 31:4 36:4	problem of to	76:15 79:9

	1 48		
process 5:11,14	propriety 82:19	60:4 65:9	45:14 47:7,14
7:5,6	prospective 37:13	purports 64:4	49:15 57:5,10
profess 77:16	protracted 66:20	purpose 45:20	75:14 80:1
profits 69:18	76:14	51:11 58:13	rates 6:1
i -			9:3,6,17,19,20
prohibitive	proud 70:22	purposes 36:7	10:5 11:1 12:18
62:3,22	provide 37:21 53:9	pursuant 83:5	13:16,20,21 18:9
promise 32:20	58:5 73:8,21	putting 40:20	19:20 20:1
proper 53:14 69:8	74:1 75:18	62:20	21:7,9 28:8,17
75:21	77:12,20 80:4		29:4,5,11,18
proponents 80:19	provided 75:12	Q	32:5 40:10,11
	provides 15:17	qualify 39:10	45:21 52:15 53:10 62:5 70:12
proposal 13:2,13	31:13 40:5 49:8	43:14	71:10 72:12
17:9 22:8 29:14 35:9,10 37:10	52:14 54:11 58:4	question 5:8 7:5	73:4,9 74:2
41:13 42:20 44:4	70:15 74:20 75:3	17:10 20:4 21:10	ŕ
45:15 46:14,15	provision 14:2,6	34:19 38:4 42:18	rather 14:2 38:18
47:7,17 65:17,18	15:4,21 25:4	43:19 47:6 50:11	65:19
74:14 76:3	28:3,4,16 29:7	52:18 55:2,17	ratio 62:1
	31:7 32:3,8,9,10	61:3,10 62:18	rational 75:18
proposals 78:3	33:12 39:21	66:12 67:5 68:4	reach 8:16 67:10
propose 49:22	50:18,21 51:10	74:9 78:6 80:10	
50:12	55:9,10 59:12,13	82:3,15,16,19	reached 7:4,9
proposed 5:9 9:16	61:14 70:16	questions 22:18	23:11 54:11,13
10:2,15 11:12	provisions 18:2	23:1 51:12 64:10	59:8 67:20
13:3,16 22:13	26:11 32:13 50:3	66:11	70:10,20 73:21 75:15 79:1
23:12,13 26:22	51:1,2 62:16	quickly 68:14	
29:14 34:14	69:7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	reaches 52:17 76:1
39:14 40:10,11	proxy 68:18 69:8	quite 14:4	reading 23:10
41:13	[quote-unquote	26:17 27:15
44:1,2,11,14,15 45:21 48:20	public 1:15 50:13 55:8 60:5	60:6	ready 77:13
49:17 60:13	85:1,18		real 34:9 74:7
62:17 63:18,20	·	R	
75:10 79:17 80:1	publication 16:22 26:18 51:6	radio 30:12 69:22	reality 48:10
83:3,16	55:5,14	raise 54:15 64:6	really 25:4 30:17
proposes 76:2	·	raised 16:10 23:1	39:6 46:1,6
	publish 36:22	63:16,17	47:12 48:11 52:7
proposing 6:18,19 18:21 19:21	49:22	65:2,6,13 80:10	60:11 69:4
42:19 76:19	published 8:18	raises 56:14	70:7,16
	25:9 26:10 29:22	1	reason 9:5 41:11
proposition 28:7	31:9 35:22 36:15	rate 31:15,18	57:22 58:7 75:17
44:13 81:21	48:13 51:1 59:12	41:13 42:20	78:18

Page 14

54:19 56:15 65:22 66:3 67:13,17,20 68:1,7 70:13,14,15,20 71:5,10,14,20,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 74:2 77:12,20 78:2,8,11,18 79:1,17 81:6 reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 reasoned 77:18 rebut 5:4 recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 15:4 regard 30:8 regarding 4:12 31:2 65:5 66:5 regardless 69:20 regardless 69:20 relate regime 34:2 regimes 30:5,11 relev: regime 34:2 regimes 30:5,11 relev: regime 34:2 regimes 30:5,11 relev: regulation 8:1 9:16:12:12:12:15:9 65:10 remain rem	7 38:15 43:4 48:5 1 85:9 1 85:9 1 85:8 51:7 6 68:3 75:11 7 38:17	uest 4:17,19 6:7 uire 39:15 7:21 54:12 uirements 3:15 39:19 erve 5:4 ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
65:22 66:3 67:13,17,20 68:1,7 70:13,14,15,20 71:5,10,14,20,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 74:2 77:12,20 78:2,8,11,18 79:1,17 81:6 reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 reasoned 77:18 rebut 5:4 recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 regard 30:8 regarding 4:12 31:2 65:5 66:5 regardless 69:20 regardless 69:20 regardless 69:20 regardless 69:20 regardless 69:20 regime 34:2 regime 30:5,11 relev: regime 30:5,11 relev: regime 30:5,11 relev: regime 30:5,11 relev: register 16:21 25:9 26:11,18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion 33: 33: registered 83:4 registered 83:4 registered 83:4 registered 83:4 regulation 8:1 9:16 12:12 13:17 17:2 32:14 36:9,16,21 37:8 39:14 42:5 50:12 repor repor repor repor repor 15:3,19,21 16:15 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	8 64:5 71:16 tory 30:5,11 3,17 33:19 7 38:15 43:4 48:5 1 85:9 res res res res res res res res	uire 39:15 7:21 54:12 uirements 3:15 39:19 erve 5:4 ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
67:13,17,20 68:1,7 70:13,14,15,20 71:5,10,14,20,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 74:2 77:12,20 78:2,8,11,18 79:1,17 81:6 reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 reasoned 77:18 rebut 5:4 recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 received 16:20 17:6 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 regarding 4:12 31:2 65:5 66:5 regardless 69:20 relate regardless 69:20 relate regimes 30:5,11 releva relati regimes 30:5,11 releva regimes 30:5,10	req 30:5,11 3,17 33:19 7 38:15 43:4 48:5 1 85:9 re 85:11 res 1 6 68:3 75:11 8,8,17	7:21 54:12 uirements 3:15 39:19 erve 5:4 ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
68:1,7 70:13,14,15,20 71:5,10,14,20,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 74:2 77:12,20 78:2,8,11,18 79:1,17 81:6 reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 reasoned 77:18 rebut 5:4 recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 83: record 30:8 regarding 4:12 31:2 65:5 66:5 regardless 69:20 relate regimes 30:5,11 releva register 16:21 25:9 26:11,18 27:5,7,19 29:22 35:19 36:3,16 46:19 50:1,7 51:6 55:5,6 65:10 registered 83:4 regulation 8:1 9:16 12:12 13:17 17:2 32:14 36:9,16,21 37:8 39:14 42:5 50:12 67:12 regulations 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repor repor repor repor repor repor repor repor repor 15:3,19,21 16:15 RECORDINGS 1:5,6	3,17 33:19 7 38:15 43:4 48:5 1 85:9 res re 85:11 res res 6 68:3 75:11 ,8,17	uirements 3:15 39:19 erve 5:4 ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
70:13,14,15,20 71:5,10,14,20,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 74:2 77:12,20 78:2,8,11,18 79:1,17 81:6 reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 reasoned 77:18 rebut 5:4 recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:2 reparding 4:12 31:2 65:5 66:5 regardless 69:20 relate regimes 30:5,11 register 16:21 25:9 26:11,18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion registered 83:4 registered 83:4 registered 83:4 regulation 8:1 9:16 12:12 13:17 17:2 32:14 remin record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 10 12 13 12 13 12 12 13 12 13 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	7 38:15 43:4 48:5 1 85:9 res res res res 6 68:3 75:11 ,8,17	3:15 39:19 erve 5:4 ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
71:5,10,14,20,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 74:2 77:12,20 78:2,8,11,18 79:1,17 81:6 reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 reasoned 77:18 recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:2 71:5,6 71:5,10,14,20,21 73:2 65:5 66:5 72 72:19 73:3,8,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 72:19 73:3,8,21 72:19 73:20 78:2,8,11,18 79:10:21 25:9 26:11,18 27:5,7,19 29:22 75:10:25:9 26:11,18 27:5,7,19 29:22 75:10:35:3,16 33: 75:10:35:31 75:10:35:31 75:10:35:31 75:10:35:35:35 75:10:35:35:35 75:10:36:35:35 75:30:36:35:35 75:30:36:35:35 75:30:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:36:35 75:30:36:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:36:36:36 75:30:3	48:5 1 res 1 85:9 res 1 85:11 res 1 6 68:3 75:11	erve 5:4 ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
74:2 77:12,20 regardless 69:20 relate 78:2,8,11,18 regime 34:2 relate 79:1,17 81:6 regime 34:2 relate reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 regimes 30:5,11 releve reasoned 77:18 26:11,18 83: rebut 5:4 35:19 36:3,16 33: recall 59:9 46:19 50:1,7 35: receive 31:16 registered 83:4 remain received 16:20 registered 83:4 remain recess 64:18,19 regs 8:2 13:8 remain recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 remain record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 rende 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 rende 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 83:7,11,15,18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 85:7 10:8,16,17 repor 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor 15:6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	res state of the s	ources 72:2,3,5 pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
78:2,8,11,18 regime 34:2 relati 79:1,17 81:6 regimes 30:5,11 relevance reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 register 16:21 25:9 61: reasoned 77:18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion 33: rebut 5:4 35:19 36:3,16 33: recall 59:9 46:19 50:1,7 35:2 receive 31:16 65:10 remain received 16:20 registered 83:4 remain 17:6 regulation 8:1 9:16 12:12 13:17 recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 remain record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 render 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 renew 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renew 69:2,13,15 regulations renew 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 83:7,11,15,18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 85:7 10:8,16,17 repor 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor 15:6 18:9 20:7 22:2 39: 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	nt 50:8 51:7 res 6 68:3 75:11 3 ,8,17 3	pect 18:18 23:4 5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
79:1,17 81:6 regimes 30:5,11 relevance reasonableness 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 26:11,18 33: reasoned 77:18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion 30:5,11 rebut 5:4 35:19 36:3,16 33: recall 59:9 46:19 50:1,7 35: receive 31:16 65:10 remail remail remail received 16:20 registered 83:4 remail remail recess 64:18,19 9:16 12:12 13:17 64: recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 remail record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 render remail 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 render remail 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repeat 82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	nt 50:8 51:7 res 6 68:3 75:11 3 ,8,17 3	5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
reasonableness register 16:21 25:9 61: 57:8 70:3 76:5,8 26:11,18 33: reasoned 77:18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion rebut 5:4 35:19 36:3,16 33: recall 59:9 46:19 50:1,7 35: receive 31:16 65:10 remain received 16:20 registered 83:4 remain 17:6 registered 83:4 remain recess 64:18,19 regulation 8:1 64: recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 remain record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 render 52:2,8 53:15 67:12 render 69:2,13,15 regulations render 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 83:7,11,15,18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 85:7 10:8,16,17 repor RECORDINGS 18:9 20:7 22:2 39: 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	6 68:3 75:11 ,8,17	5:7 31:1 2:7,11 41:10
57:8 70:3 76:5,8 register 16:21 25:9 83:2 reasoned 77:18 26:11,18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion 3:1 rebut 5:4 46:19 50:1,7 35:2 recall 59:9 51:6 55:5,6 remain 3:1 receive 31:16 registered 83:4 remain 3:1 received 16:20 registered 83:4 remain 3:1 recess 64:18,19 regulation 8:1 64: record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 remain 3:1 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 render 3:1 69:2,13,15 regulations 3:1 render 3:1 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 3:1 83:2 repor 3:1 repor 3:1 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 3:1 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor 3:1 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	,8,17	
reasoned 77:18 27:5,7,19 29:22 religion 35:19 36:3,16 recall 59:9 46:19 50:1,7 35:2 receive 31:16 received 16:20 registered 83:4 remain re	´	A 1 F
rebut 5:4 35:19 36:3,16 33: recall 59:9 51:6 55:5,6 remain receive 31:16 registered 83:4 remain received 16:20 registered 83:4 remain recess 64:18,19 regs 8:2 13:8 remain recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 64: record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 render 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 render 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renum 69:2,13,15 regulations repeat 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repeat 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	113 114 / 1	9:15
recall 59:9 receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 receive 31:16 65:10 registered 83:4 regulation 8:1 9:16 12:12 13:17 17:2 32:14 remain 64: rem	7,19 34:1 res	pective 1:18
receive 31:16 received 16:20 17:6 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 remainder remaind	· 1	pond 65:1,3
received 16:20 registered 83:4 remainstrance 17:6 regs 8:2 13:8 remainstrance recess 64:18,19 regulation 8:1 64: secollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 reminstrance record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 render 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 renew 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renew 69:2,13,15 regulations renum 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 23:7,16 39: 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	ader 65:21 8	0:9
received 16:20 registered 83:4 remainstrance 17:6 regs 8:2 13:8 remainstrance recess 64:18,19 regulation 8:1 64: 84:3 9:16 12:12 13:17 7:2 32:14 record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 render 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 renew 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renew 69:2,13,15 regulations renum 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 23:7,16 39: 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	ned 60:8 res	ponse 16:21
regs 8:2 13:8 recess 64:18,19 84:3 recollect 58:19 record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 regulation 8:1 9:16 12:12 13:17 17:2 32:14 remin 36:9,16,21 37:8 39:14 42:5 50:12 renum repor 15:10,14 6:3,5,20 repor 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13	1 8	2:16
recess 64.18,19 regulation 8:1 64: recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 remin record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 rende 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 rende 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renum 69:2,13,15 regulations renum 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 repea 82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 18:9 20:7 22:2 39: 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	res	t 80:17,19
84:3 9:16 12:12 13:17 recollect 58:19 17:2 32:14 record 31:17 36:9,16,21 37:8 52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renew renum 73:1,7,20 81:13 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 RECORDINGS 18:9 20:7 22:2 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13	res 0 80:16 res	tate 66:17
record 31:17 52:2,8 53:15 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 17:2 52:14 36:9,16,21 37:8 39:14 42:5 50:12 renew renum regulations regulations repor 10:8,16,17 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10.12 36:13 7:5,20 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 7:20 72:20 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 7:20 72:20 7:		trictions 60:6
52:2,8 53:15 39:14 42:5 50:12 renew 54:17 57:9 58:13 67:12 renum 69:2,13,15 regulations repea 82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 18:9 20:7 22:2 39: 1:5,6 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	aca 19.22	ulting 44:21
52.2,8 53.13 54:17 57:9 58:13 69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 67:12 regulations 5:10,14 6:3,5,20 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 10:8,16,17 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 67:12 renur repor 39: 61:	33.7	
69:2,13,15 73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 regulations 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 10:8,16,17 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 renum renum repea repea 39: 61:	5.1 res	ults 37:9
73:1,7,20 81:13 82:18 83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 10:8,16,17 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 repea repor repor 39: 61:	3.1	ained 3:21
82:18 7:5,12 8:3 9:7 repor 83:7,11,15,18 10:8,16,17 repor 85:7 15:3,19,21 16:15 repor RECORDINGS 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	3.1	
83:7,11,15,18 85:7 RECORDINGS 1:5,6 10:8,16,17 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	bered 26:12 reta	hink 22:14
RECORDINGS 1:5,6 15:3,19,21 16:15 18:9 20:7 22:2 23:7,16 31:6 10 12 36:13 61:	bered 26:12 reta 68:15 reta	
1:5,6 23:7,16 39: 61:	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev	hink 22:14 iew 84:1
1:5,6 25.7,10 31:6 10.12 36:13 61:	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2
JI.U.IV.IZ.JU.IJ.I ===	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 right ing 1:15 Rol	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10
1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 right ing 1:15 Rol 9 Rol	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10 berts 2:3 5:15
reduced 85:5 39:8 40:13,14 69:	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 right ing 1:15 Roll 9 Roll 3,15,17,20 8	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10
refer 21:13 41:6,8,11,15 repre	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 rigg ing 1:15 9	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10 berts 2:3 5:15 :13 9:14,15 0:10,13 1:4,9,16 12:3
42:3,7,8,9,11,22 repre	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 righ ing 1:15 9	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10 berts 2:3 5:15 :13 9:14,15 0:10,13 1:4,9,16 12:3 4:13,21 15:9
43:22	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 righ ing 1:15 9	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10 berts 2:3 5:15 :13 9:14,15 0:10,13 1:4,9,16 12:3 4:13,21 15:9 7:7,21 18:12
44:3,10,17,21	bered 26:12 rets 68:15 rets 82:20 rev er 5:16 rigg ing 1:15 9	hink 22:14 iew 84:1 hts 52:2 bedee 3:10 berts 2:3 5:15 :13 9:14,15 0:10,13 1:4,9,16 12:3 4:13,21 15:9

	ı ag		
23:19,22	80:4,6	sets 21:7,8 38:8	Shari 1:14 85:2,18
24:7,12,16	scheme 30:18	42:10	short 64:1
25:2,6,12,15,22	33:19 34:17 35:1	setting 32:5 53:10	shows 62:2 70:17
26:4,9,13,20	37:21 48:5 52:17	settle 23:15 48:21	73:20 79:8
27:3,12 28:1,10,14 30:21	schemes 32:17	52:4 55:7 77:5	
36:14 43:19	34:10 37:16 43:4	settled 6:16 66:22	sides 7:13,15
45:19 46:13	46:2	77:5	side's 78:2
47:1,17,21 48:11	schools 62:21	settlement 1:11	signed 59:18
49:16,21 50:10	scratching 8:20,21	3:19 4:4,9 5:2,21	significant 51:21
51:13 59:4,19,22	second 25:13	6:10,16,20,21	similar 50:22
60:11,20 61:6	35:14 72:9	7:3,4 8:17,18	
66:12 67:2,4,13 68:1,6,9 70:5		11:2,8 13:4	simply 8:11 10:19 19:8 21:1,14
71:20 72:9 73:10	section 21:17,18 25:6,10 26:21	14:11 17:2,19	38:20 58:12 64:5
74:6 75:19 76:17	28:21,22 29:1	19:14 21:6 22:4	81:5
77:7 78:1,13,16	32:20 41:1 43:12	23:3,4,11,13 25:17 27:11 31:1	single 71:8
79:11,12,18	54:6 55:11 70:9	35:8 40:19,22	sir 7:14 63:14
80:10 82:17	71:18	49:7,12,22	64:7,11 80:2
robes 79:14	Sections 13:15	50:2,3 54:7,12	· 1
Robinson-	sector 28:18 29:5	56:6 59:8,15	sitting 76:21
Pactman 55:12	44:18 49:1,2	60:4,6 62:17	situation 30:4,6
rolling 46:12	71:11 77:15	63:18,20 64:14	38:1 75:5
Royalty 1:1 2:2	sectors 71:2	65:9 66:6,7,9,19	situations 33:10
82:21	seek 42:5	67:11,12,15,20 69:7 70:15	41:6
RPR 1:14		72:16,18,21	Sledge 2:3
	seeking 57:15	73:8,21 74:11	4:2,13,19
rule-making 61:18	seemed 71:3	75:9,15 76:19,20	5:6,8,13
63:5	seems 35:8	77:19	6:2,12,18 7:2,14,18 9:8,13
rules 58:6 61:17	seller 57:4	83:3,9,13,14	12:11 13:9,11
ruling 56:20	76:6,8,15 77:1	settlements	15:13 16:2,9
rushing 3:8 48:12	78:4	6:9,13,15	19:2 20:2,15
	sense 20:10,14	48:18,22 49:17	22:18 23:21
S	44:19 45:8,15	54:11 70:10,21,22 71:5	25:19 26:2,16
sampling 69:10	50:15 54:7	73:2,18 75:4	27:4,8 35:18 36:12 37:1 38:17
satisfied 56:8 82:8	55:3,12 56:7	79:1,17,22 82:19	39:13 40:7
satisfy 18:3 38:12	sentence 18:13	settles 49:1	41:3,17,21 43:18
1	43:2,3,11 47:8		44:7 51:12,14,17
saw 28:2,5	sequencing 53:12	several 65:1	52:11,20
schedule 48:8	served 51:10	share 8:14	53:3,7,18
	3-2:		54:10,18,21

56:12 57:12,17	63:8 65:3 66:1	STANLEY 2:4	Stoltz 3:3,15
58:17 59:1	69:9 70:8,20	start 22:22	4:6,7,17,22
64:8,11,17,20	71:12,19	started 13:11 32:7	5:7,12,15,18
65:4 68:10	72:7,13,14,15	70:6	6:8,17,22
80:11,14 82:12	76:1 78:6,8		7:8,17,20
83:19,22	SoundExchange's	starts 48:7	8:12,13 9:1,11
Sledge's 17:10	9:3 23:2 37:10	statement 7:2	10:7,12,21
47:6	48:18 65:17	42:12 65:11,12	11:8,14,22
small 14:22 21:20	66:22 72:4	81:4	12:15,20 13:5,13
39:21 81:16	sounds 19:3 43:18	statements 41:22	14:3,8,13,17 15:7 16:1,7,16
82:15	Southeast 1:13 2:5	STATES 1:1	17:15 18:6,22
smaller 62:20	speak 63:1	station 18:7 30:14	19:10,22 20:9,18
81:22	1 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	42:4	21:5 22:5,17
solicit 82:10	speaks 70:2 82:18		64:21,22 65:5
solution 33:10	specific	stations 18:2	66:15 67:3,8,18
1	62:10,11,16	30:1,12 61:13 62:21 63:9 69:22	68:3,8,15 80:9
somehow 12:12	63:17,19	81:16,22 82:4,8	82:12,14 83:19
19:17 70:6	65:6,8,16		strapped 81:16
someone 8:9 10:18	specifically 4:3	station's 17:17	Street 3:4
14:12 33:13	44:20 71:5	statute 23:10	strictly 61:10
somewhat 52:18	specifying 12:12	32:10,11 33:2,3,6 49:3	structure 34:13
songwriters 31:15	spectrum 79:11	50:7,9 52:10	structures 43:15
sorry 9:13 24:4	speculation 58:1	53:5,7,20,21	stuck 17:22 19:20
26:14 28:22	speech 69:19	54:4,6,10,22	20:1
35:16 38:4 44:16	speeches 63:2	56:13 58:22 59:2	
57:16 59:3 66:16	· •	66:18 67:9 68:4	student 81:16
sort 26:18 30:7,11	spend 40:3 53:20	72:6 75:2,22 76:11	stumbled 24:10
46:11 51:7 55:9	spoke 18:12 19:10		subcategorization
SOUND 1:5	22:6	statutory 15:19,22 16:6,14	12:8
SoundExchange	stand 78:4	20:10,11,13,16,2	subject 13:21 29:4
2:7 3:19 4:5 5:3	standard 32:1	2 21:3,11,12,14	30:19 32:17
7:10 10:20 15:17	33:4 76:2	22:1 28:8	33:13,20
16:2,12 19:9	83:9,17	31:3,5,7 37:21	34:2,10,13,15,16
22:10,14 23:6,14	standards 77:17	38:22 40:15	35:1 41:15 42:10
27:10,13 38:20	78:20	43:4,14 47:14	60:5
39:2,9,11,17	standing 56:8	51:7 52:1,14,17	submit 15:16
40:2,13 42:19	65:20 68:17	83:8,17	67:15 83:18
48:15 49:4,7,9 50:18 56:17	stands 50:20	stenotypy 85:5	submits 72:16
57:22 58:3 61:12	Stanus JU.20	STEVEN 2:9	submitted 13:8
		· · · · - · - · ·	

	, I ag	·	
14:10 16:20	talked 33:17	61:8 64:7,11,20	64:4
25:16 26:8 29:9	talking 34:5 53:22	68:10,13 80:8	they've 16:3 55:15
40:12 47:15	59:6 62:15	82:11 83:19 84:3	56:1,4 58:17
68:19 69:22		that's 4:15 6:17,22	·
70:11 82:4	talks 31:8 46:7	1 ' 1	third 52:5 56:10
aubmitting 50.10	ten 64:18 72:12,14	8:20 9:15	60:12
submitting 58:10	1	13:2,10 16:7,10	thousands 69:18
subpart 28:3	tens 69:18	17:5 18:14,16	
Subsection 13:9	term 17:12 59:5	22:5 24:7,21	threshold 54:15
subset 8:6	60:12	25:15 28:10,15 29:16 31:18	56:15
subset 8:6	terminate 53:13	1	timely 73:15
sufficiently 48:17	72:20	32:22 33:4	tiny 77:12
suggested 79:10		34:14,19 36:3	•
1	terms 5:21 6:1	37:3,12,18	titled 24:14
suggesting 8:8	8:2,18	39:5,6,16,20	today 4:2,11 18:21
14:1 36:14	9:4,6,17,19,20	40:17 41:10,20	29:6,9 34:14
suggests 13:2	11:1 12:9,18	43:1 44:6	38:14 41:16
69:16	13:16,20,22 16:5	46:11,13 47:4,5 50:6,12 54:20	65:8,13 73:13
Suite 2:11,16,20	18:2,4,9 19:17	56:12 57:5 61:2	75:7 79:15
	21:3,7,9 29:5,18	63:16 66:10	today's 22:13
summary 23:12	30:2,16 31:3,8	68:3,7 71:3 72:6	· I
support 4:8 57:9	37:7	1 ' 1	total 52:17
supporting 70:1	38:8,11,13,16	73:16,22 75:8,21 76:19,20 77:9	toto 66:3
	39:11 40:10,11	78:16 79:3,6	toward 55:20
suppose 75:12	43:8 45:21 47:14	·	
supposed 67:16	52:9,15 53:10,16	themselves 55:6	transcription 85:7
sure 14:8 18:7	59:10 62:5,12	theory 71:10 72:22	Tremaine 2:15
25:8 27:9 31:22	65:17,20,21 66:3 67:9 70:12	thereafter 85:5	Tribunal 2:2
32:18 34:20	73:4,9 76:11		
35:18 59:22	77:6	therefore 13:1	tried 47:5 55:15
		49:10 75:17	true 7:3 32:8 85:7
suspect 18:7	testified 81:18	78:10	trump 32:13
Suzanne 3:9	testify 4:18 74:13	there's 11:18	1
swayed 74:3	testimony	19:15,19	trust 32:19,21 80:3
	4:8,18,20 62:2	21:12,19,20 33:2	try 68:14
sweep 43:10	63:10 75:11	35:10 48:7,11	trying 18:14,16
System 2:18	76:22 80:21	49:14 53:1 56:21	33:15 40:4 43:21
16:11,18	85:4,7	57:8 63:3 66:8	64:1 71:8,19
	ĺ	69:13 70:13	79:6
T	text 22:7 75:1,2	75:15 78:17	
tack 55:19	Thank 4:22	they'd 10:22	turn 25:3
talk 47:1	22:17,19,21	they're 6:16 18:1,4	turns 45:5
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	27:12 51:19 55:1	39:3,18 57:14,19	two-week 69:10
		37.3,10 3/:14,19	

	ı ag		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
type 8:11 31:2 32:8,9 typewriting 85:6	unnecessary 44:4 51:8 unprecedented	warranted 79:16 Washington 1:2,7,14	29:12,13,20 34:12,15 35:9 36:2,5,6 37:11
type withing 05.0	33:1	2:6,11,16,21 3:5	38:9,10 39:15,22
			41:1,7,14 42:22
Uh-huh 49:20	unreasonable	wasn't 24:10 69:4	43:9,10 44:5,21
78:12	65:22 69:15	waste 53:18 72:2,4	45:3,6,9 47:10
	71:9,22 72:2 73:16 74:14 77:5	wasting 79:5	48:6 64:3
umbrella 21:22	78:21 79:4,9	ways 77:18	67:1,22 71:2
uncertainty 45:4	•		72:12,15,17 73:6
unclear 45:2	unrelated 56:10	wearing 79:14	74:9 76:2,4 77:5 81:3,9
uncontroversial	unsuccessful	Web 29:10,15,17	•
28:7	43:17	35:5 37:9	webcasting 1:5 4:3
	upon 47:22 48:2	38:7,16 43:1	15:1 17:3 20:22
understand 6:2	users 6:11 37:22	44:21 45:3 47:7	40:9,10,12,14 41:8 42:7 43:22
9:1 12:15,21 14:5 15:13 22:16	45015 0,11 5,122	48:8,22 53:13 54:9 56:21 58:13	44:3,10 49:2
34:18 38:17	V	61:20 63:5	58:6 60:8,10
41:21 49:18 57:7	vacuum 65:20		66:14 72:11
61:6 63:15		webcaster 5:20	we'd 64:22
66:18,21	valuation 63:7	6:10,15,21	
understanding	value 61:12 62:4	7:4,11,12 8:4,6,7,10,11,17,	Wednesday 1:8
5:19 6:8 7:8 8:4	63:9 69:5	18 10:14 11:1,11	welcomed 49:4
9:2 10:22 12:1	VanEaton 2:19	12:2 13:19 20:1	we'll 22:10
13:5 14:17	varies 18:7	21:1,6 22:4 25:1	64:17,20 84:1,3
15:7,10,11	various 30:1	27:21 28:20	we're 4:7 19:11
16:8,22 17:15		29:2,7 30:4,8,18	30:6 32:2,4 43:3
20:19 52:3 65:3	vary 83:12	31:1 34:9	50:3 59:4 61:4
understood 54:3	version 25:9 26:19	37:15,17 38:21	66:15 77:15
63:22	27:7	39:9 42:16 43:13	78:9,11 80:21
unfairly 70:7	via 63:1	45:20 47:18,22 48:3 58:3	we've 16:19 27:10
uninformed 14:22	view 17:21 21:16	59:7,8,15 60:4	28:4 47:8 48:16
	violation 69:19	77:13 78:7	53:15 54:8 59:6
unique 30:11	j	webcasters	61:10
UNITED 1:1	vision 75:1	9:18,20,21	whatever 31:19
unlawful 32:6	Volume 35:20	10:1,4,6,9	46:3 77:4
33:1,7	volumes 70:2	11:7,21 12:6,19	Whereupon 84:4
unless 15:16 19:16	voluntary 6:10	13:14 15:16	whether 27:16
31:16 38:16 50:2	. 01441441 J 0.10	18:11 19:6	29:10 32:4,5
53:8 70:12 78:17	W	23:8,17	34:12,14 41:12
unlike 82:9	- Y Y	24:4,13,20 27:17	45:2 52:13 54:18

T	10	١
Page	10	ł
1 ugc	エノ	•
\mathcal{O}		

	1 48	
55:3 56:15 61:4,20 69:5 73:14 77:19 79:16,17 83:15	witness 4:18 75:11 witnesses 69:17 74:13,17 76:21	
whichever 17:12 30:15	80:22 wonder 14:11	
whole 37:20 44:17 64:2 65:19 80:19	wonderful 76:13,18 wondering 4:10	
wholly 74:14	working 75:22	
whom 67:21 85:2	world 7:15 20:7	
whose 38:11	37:2 39:11	
wide 23:16 42:14 44:9	76:13,18 worry 60:21	
widely 83:12	wrath 81:16	
Wil 3:10	Wright 2:15	
Willer 3:10	written 13:20	
WILLIAM 2:3,19	45:1,8 62:12 68:19 82:4	
willing 57:4 76:5,6,8,14,15,2	wrong 53:22	
2 77:1 78:3,9 81:14	WSA 35:21 36:10 38:9 40:16	
wired 21:21		
wireless 21:21	Y 2 10	
wish 15:10 17:13 53:21	York 2:10 yours 46:5	
wishes 65:3	yourself 19:4	
Wisniewski 2:4 8:8 12:20 13:7,10 14:1,4,10 19:12 33:14 34:4,8,18,22 35:7 36:8,11 37:12,20 41:4 58:9 62:8 63:12,15 64:7 79:21 80:3,8 81:7 82:2,11	you've 10:10,15 13:8 23:1 25:16 26:1 36:17 44:10 54:8 59:1 84:1	

MAY 19 ZUTU

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS Washington, D.C.

IN THE MATTER OF:

DIGITAL PERFORMANCE RIGHT in : Docket No. 2009-1 SOUND RECORDINGS and EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.

: CRB Webcasting III

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, May 5, 2010

The following pages constitute the Motion to Adopt Partial Settlement in the above-captioned matter at the Library of Congress, Madison Building, 101 Independence Avenue, Southeast, Washington, D.C., before Shari R. Broussard, RPR, CSR, of Capital Reporting Company, a Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia, beginning at approximately 9:30 a.m. when were present on behalf of the respective parties:

> (866) 448 - DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com © 2010

1



Complimentary MiniCD

Attached is your MiniCD, containing your ASCII, .PDF and .VDF files, which are complimentary with every Capital Reporting Company transcript.



(Works in regular CD drive.)

Instructions for using your Visionary .VDF Transcript Viewer:

- 1) Insert the MiniCD in your disk drive.
- 2) Open the disk on your computer and you will see a folder with the deponent's name and the deposition date. Open this folder.
- 3) Click on the "Viewer Start" file to begin installation of the Visionary Viewer to your computer. It will take less than two minutes.
- 4) Once installation is complete, open the "data" folder to find your .VDF, .TXT and .PDF files. You can now open the .VDF file in the Visionary Viewer.

Please call us if you have any questions!